JKM LIBRARY
HN31.M787
Montgomery, Harry Earl.
Christ's social remedies
3 9968 02657 2415

Christ's Social Remedies

Harry Earl Montgomery

ACCESSION NUMBER
34382
SHELF NUMBER
HN
31
M787
The Virginia Library
McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago.
From the _____ Fund.
RECEIVED _____

By Harry Earl Montgomery

VITAL AMERICAN PROBLEMS

An Attempt to Solve the "Trust," "Labor" and "Negro" Problems

CHRIST'S SOCIAL REMEDIES

CHRIST'S SOCIAL REMEDIES

BY

HARRY EARL MONTGOMERY

AUTHOR OF "VITAL AMERICAN PROBLEMS"

VIRGINIA LIBRARY

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
NEW YORK AND LONDON
The Knickerbocker Press
1911

Copyright, 1911
by
HARRY EARL MONTGOMERY

32312

VIRGINIA LIBRARY
MCCORMICK
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

HN
31
M797

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I.—Responsibility of Citizenship	1
II.—Was Christ an Anarchist?	19
III.—Was Christ a Socialist?	31
IV.—The Kingdom of God	115
V.—Non-Resistance	139
VI.—Marriage and Divorce	159
VII.—Crime and the Criminal	201
VIII.—Wealth	247
IX.—Labour	301
X.—Sunday Observance	331
XI.—International Controversies	345
XII.—Social Reconstruction	389
Index	411

RESPONSIBILITY OF CITIZENSHIP

RESPONSIBILITY OF CITIZENSHIP

IN 1787, the delegates selected by the people of the various American states assembled in general convention at the city of Philadelphia and prepared a plan of government which they submitted to the people for ratification. After a period of heated discussion, the proposed constitution was finally ratified and formally adopted by the free voice of the people of the original thirteen states, and the American nation was born.

The Federal Constitution is a body of definite powers specifically delegated by the people, creating a form of government, national in its scope, and, to the extent of its powers, absolute and supreme. All power residing in the sovereignty of the people, not delegated to the Federal government, was distinctly retained and reserved by them.

For its life and preservation, the Federal Government rests upon the expressed will of the citizens of the United States. The people alone have the right to change or to abolish it, a right they may exercise at any time in the way provided by the Federal Constitution.

The State constitutions and all laws, in like manner, exist through the wishes of the people of the several States, and, within the expressed limits prescribed by the Federal Constitution, may be changed or repealed at the peoples' will.

The basis, therefore, upon which the Federal Government, State constitutions, and all laws rest is the wish and desire of the American people.

Regarding this wish and desire, called "public opinion," Hon. James Bryce has said:

"Public opinion has really been the chief and ultimate power in nearly all nations at nearly all times.

"The difference between despotically-governed and free countries does not exist in the fact that the latter are ruled by opinion and the former by force, for both are generally ruled by opinion. It consists rather in this, that in the former the people instinctively obey a power which they do not know to be really of their own creation, and to stand by their own permission, whereas in the latter the people feel their supremacy, and consciously treat their rulers as their agents; while the rulers obey a power which they admit to have made and to be able to unmake them—the popular will.

"Towering over Presidents and State Governors, over Congress and State Legislatures, over conventions and the vast machinery of party, public opinion stands out, in the United States, as the great source of power, the master of servants who tremble before it."[1]

[1] *Am. Commonwealth*, 2 ed. Rev. vol. ii., pp. 247, 249, 255.

Public opinion is "the judgment of a self-conscious community upon any subject of general interest."[1] It is not, however, "the arithmetical sum of the opinions of the individuals who compose the society," but "many opinions mutually modify each other, and result in a common conviction which may differ in some degree from that of each person involved."[2]

Public opinion may be likened to a composite portrait, made by the printing, one over another, of photographic negatives of different persons, resulting in a portrait which is easily distinguishable from any of the likenesses which helped to form it, but in which each one has exercised a material influence. It may also be likened to the music of an orchestra, made up, as it is, of divergent but related sounds. Each instrument directly affects the music of the orchestra by its tone and volume; the larger the orchestra, the less effect the individual instrument may exert, but that each instrument contributes to the resultant sounds is beyond question.

Public opinion, the social orchestral music, the composite photograph of the co-operative individuals composing the society, is the omnipotent American sovereign, to whose voice all listen and to whose commands all submit.

[1] *Sociology*, by Prof. Giddings, p. 138.

[2] Introduction to the *Study of Society*, by Small & Vincent, p. 307.

Effect of Public Opinion on Individual Opinion.—The individual, consciously or unconsciously, adheres largely to the prevailing social traditions, customs, rules, and forms affecting the questions of housing, clothing, eating, and general deportment. Not only in the outward manifestation of his life does the individual conform to social rules and customs, but also in his attitude toward many great questions, religious, social, and political, does he unconsciously adopt the accepted social teachings.

"A man is a social outcome rather than a social unit," writes Professor Baldwin. "He is always, in his greatest part, also some one else. Social acts of his—that is, acts which may not prove anti-social—are his because they are society's first; otherwise he would not have learned them nor have had any tendency to do them. Everything that he learns is copied, reproduced, assimilated from his fellows: and what all of them including him—all his fellows, the socii—do and think, they do and think because they have each been through the same course of copying, reproducing, assimilating, that he has."[1]

Formation of Individual Opinion.—To create an opinion out of our inner process of thought which is unaffected and uninfluenced by the opinions of others, is practically an impossibility. Our attitude toward a question is determined largely by hereditary traits, general

[1] *Social and Ethical Interpretations*, p. 81.

environment, early teachings, companions, books, work, and the society in which we live. Our opinion may be the result of careful study of other men's opinions combined with deep personal thinking, or it may be the wholesale adoption of the views of some one else, but in any case, it is formed largely from the teachings of society or from the teachings conveyed through the written page or through the voice of friends, companions, and public speakers.

Mr. George E. Vincent, in the following words, has described the usual way in which individual opinion is formed:

"You read the morning paper and you have certain impulses, certain ideas come to your mind as a result of your habits, of your past experiences, of your business interests; and then you go out on the street and meet a man and you raise the question with him and he quite agrees with you and you are quite sure that you are absolutely right. You meet another man and he agrees and then your impression is deepened. And you meet another man who says you are entirely on the wrong track. Then your idea is weakened. You go on and meet another man, good friend of yours, who suggests that you are completely off, that you are overworking, that your mind is going to give way. Then you are n't at all sure about that conviction. Then you go on and meet another person who says, 'Where did you get that absurd notion? Absolutely wrong. This is the thing to believe.' Then you go away somewhere, and, as Mr. Dooley says, 'you throw

your idea in the alley when nobody is looking.' Or, you may go on during the day and you get testimony, you get suggestion; these suggestions bear upon you; part of them lead to one thing, part to another. You modify your view; it is moulded; it is plastic in your mind; this man adds a little here, that man on that side. So the thing during the day is moulded until toward night you begin to have a conviction. Then you come home and you have a conviction. President Wilson of Princeton has put this in a capable way. He says that things have to be discussed interjectionally at the breakfast table—notice the adjective—a man says, 'Well, I declare. For Heaven's sake, what is coming next?'—then laconically on the street, desultorily on the street-car and then dogmatically at dinner. You see the picture of the man coming home and letting his wife and children know the real truth about it—what papa thinks—oh, what papa thinks—think of being an oracle to your children, and yet you are behind the scenes and you know how you got that conviction and you know it was suggested to you."[1]

Dr. Arthur Twining Hadley has well said:

"We are affected by the judgment of those about us, whether we will or no, and many of those who most loudly protest that they are living their life for themselves are really just as much affected as any one else. 'If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand I am not of the body, is it therefore not of the body?' Amid the daily contact of our social life habits of

[1] Address before Liberal Club of Buffalo, 1904.

thought, standards of value, subtle influences in the estimate of right and wrong, pass from man to man just as quietly and unconsciously as the blood passes from one part of the body to another, bearing seeds of life or death to the whole body, as the case may be."[1]

Effect of Individual Opinion on Public Opinion.—Diderot, in 1775, in a letter to Neckar, said:

"Opinion! that volatile something, with whose power for good and for evil we are all acquainted, in its origin is nothing but the work of a small number of men who speak only after having thought and who continually form in different sections of society centres of instruction, from whence both errors and reasoned truths are disseminated little by little to the farthest limits of the city in which they are established, as articles of faith."[2]

The history of the temperance movement in the United States is illustrative of the way in which individual opinion affects public opinion.

A hundred years ago, social drinking was common and very generally practised, even by ministers and church members, with the approval of public opinion.

At that time, a few citizens began to collect facts as to the use of liquor and its injurious effect

[1] *Baccalaureate Addresses*, pp. 205, 206.

[2] Quoted by Tarde, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

on the individual and on society, and personally refrained from drinking. They taught their children to practice total abstinence, urged their friends to abstain from drinking, and gradually won recruits to their views. These recruits, in turn, became missionaries of the temperance cause, vigorously carried on this crusade through the passing years, and gradually modified general opinion with regard to the drinking habit. After a century of agitation, public opinion on this subject has grown in strength and power until total abstinence is now practiced largely throughout the United States, and legal prohibition of the manufacture and sale of liquor has been adopted in many of the Western and Southern States, and in certain localities in the North.

Prof. Jeremiah W. Jenks has said:

"Few people who have not made the effort have any clear conception as to the amount of influence, especially on local matters, that one individual may exert by a little judicious talk with a few men of influence in different classes of society. I have more than once seen one man within two days practically change, or formulate, one might better say, the opinion of a large part of a community by a dozen conversations with as many different men, each representing some special social or business class."[1]

"From a modern economic point of view there is no

[1] Guidance of Public Opinion, *Am. Journal of Sociology*, vol. i, p. 165.

such thing, in strictness, as a mere individual," writes Rev. Washington Gladden. "Market prices, wages, profits—all these are social, not individual, products. Every one's economic acts more or less affect every one else; and every one is dependent on others for the means of economic action. The market price of a loaf of bread, of a day's labour, is fixed not by the individual, but by the social organism. A thousand different forces combine to determine it. The social estimate of what your day's work is worth —that is what your day's work will bring you. Thus society continually acts upon you, shaping the issues of your life. And you, by your choices and efforts, are as constantly acting upon society. By what you do, by what you say, by what you are, society is affected in its economical, its ethical, its political, interests. Most true is it—how much more true to-day than when the great apostle said it—that no man liveth to himself."[1]

Possessing, as we do, the power to mould public opinion, the non-use of such power is only equalled in its deterrent effect by its misuse.

John Stuart Mill in his address at St. Andrew's in 1867, said:

"Let not any one pacify his conscience by the delusion that he can do no harm if he takes no part and forms no opinion. Bad men need nothing more to compass their ends than that good men should look on and do nothing. He is not a good man who, without a protest, allows wrong to be committed in his name,

[1] *Christianity and Socialism*, p. 167.

and with the means which he helps to supply because he will not trouble himself to use his mind on the subject."

The responsibility resting upon the individual for holding correct opinions on the vital questions of the day is tremendous, because of the fact that the individual is constantly affecting the opinions of others and assisting in the formation of public opinion. Since this great responsibility rests upon our shoulders, when and how can we obtain correct views?

If we turn to China where the teachings of Confucius rule almost supreme, what conditions do we find? We find the Chinese people living unprogressive, narrow, selfish lives with feelings and interests restricted to the family circle. "Thou shalt not" do this and "thou shalt not" do that, is the sum total of the teachings of Confucius. Serviceableness is limited to the family, and indifference is the only attitude taken towards the life and suffering of others. China, living as it does according to the teachings of Confucius, is a backward, unenviable nation.

If we turn to India, where the teachings of Buddha and Brahma govern the lives of the people, we find ignorance, unprogressiveness, selfishness, caste, immorality, and general degradation rampant.

If we turn to Turkey and Arabia, we find that the teachings of Mohammed have degraded

womanhood; and where womanhood, the source of the social life, is defiled, individual life, social life, and national life must necessarily be on a low plane.

Through the ages many of the great philosophers propounded theories of righteousness upon which they attempted to build systems of morality for the uplift and regeneration of mankind. Their treatises have attracted attention, and some few have endeavoured to live by their precepts, but their theories as guiding forces have passed out of the lives of men, and are relegated to the curio-cabinets which contain the unworkable formulas for the regulation of life.

James Martineau asserts that Jesus Christ may be called "The regenerator of the human race. The world has changed," he says, "and that change is historically traceable to Christ."

Certain it is, that the transformation which society has undergone cannot be accounted for apart from the teachings of Christ. "Many great men," as Professor Jenks has put it, "have deeply affected the history of the world. Jesus has changed the fundamental nature of society."

Christ came to proclaim the sacredness of manhood and womanhood, the infinite worth of the individual, as the child of God, and His teachings constitute the basis of present day civilisation. His teaching that human brotherhood exists between the people of every race, colour, and

condition of life, has broken the bonds of slavery and unshackled the limbs of man. In no Christian land to-day, is there to be found a slave, and it is only in countries where the teachings of other religious leaders are supreme that slavery exists.

"Charity was one of the earliest, as it was one of the noblest, creations of Christianity," writes Lecky.[1] Not the mere casting of alms, but the giving of self along with the material gifts, was the distinguishing feature of the teachings of Christ.

Love to man as undergirding life was fundamental in Christ's gospel, and that teaching of love has been the force which has built hospitals, asylums, and homes for the poor and the aged, and transformed savagery into civilisation.

James Russell Lowell has said:

"The worst kind of religion is no religion at all, and these men living in ease and luxury, indulging themselves in the amusement of going without religion, may be thankful that they live in lands where the Gospel they neglect has tamed the beastliness and ferocity of the men who, but for Christianity, might long ago have eaten their carcasses like the South Sea Islanders, or cut off their heads and tanned their hides like the monsters of the French Revolution. When the microscopic search of skepticism, which had hunted the heavens and sounded the seas to disprove the existence of a Creator, has turned its attention to human

[1] W. E. H. Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe*, ii., p. 236

society and has found a place on this planet ten miles square where a decent man can live in comfort and security, supporting and educating his children unspoiled and unpolluted; a place where age is reverenced, infancy protected, manhood respected, womanhood honoured, and human life held in due regard; when skeptics can find such a place ten miles square on this globe, where the Gospel of Christ has not gone and cleared the way and laid the foundation and made decency and security possible, it will then be in order for the skeptical literati to move thither and there ventilate their views."[1]

If we compare the teachings of Christ with those of the world's greatest leaders in philosophy, eloquence, and song, as to their regenerative effect on the lives of mankind, we will be compelled to admit that Christ "spoke as never man spake."

Since the days of Constantine, Christianity has been the professed religion of all civilised nations. It was officially accepted by the Roman Empire on the eve of its downfall, and since that time it has shaped and moulded the social life of all European countries as well as formed the basis of American social life; and it may be stated, without fear of contradiction, that Christianity has inspired the present-day religious, ethical, juridical, and philosophical ideas of man. Daniel Webster in the "Girard Will case" de-

[1] Quoted from *The Deathless Book*, by D. O. Mears, p. 296.

clared: "The Christian religion, in its general principles, must ever be regarded among us as the foundation of civil society."

The late President Anderson of the University of Rochester, in a paper before the American Social Science Association, said:

"As every civil code, in its formation and growth, adopts the moral code of the people for which it furnishes the rules of government, so the common law of England and the United States has absorbed and is still absorbing into itself the moral principles of Christianity. Hence the Christian system is the moral source of an undetermined but very large part of our common as well as of our statute law. In this sense, Christianity has contributed enormously to the common law, and also to the code of Justinian, and the legal systems of all Christendom."

Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis has written:

"Take the seed idea and the mother principles of Christianity out of the last one thousand years of time, and society's storehouse, called galleries and libraries, would be emptied. An English Jurist tells of falling asleep and dreaming that every Christian idea had been stricken out of his law-books. Opening the familiar books, he found one third of each page blank, and all pages meaningless. Thus, if by divine fiat every Christian idea should be blotted out of the library, the museum, the statute books, all would become meaningless. The very structure of civilisation would crumble into a heap of ruins.

Eloquence, song, laws, reforms, civic virtues, would fall with the fall of the great ideas that produced them."[1]

Since, therefore, the stability and the continuance of our system of government and human uplift and racial advancement are conditioned on a high and lofty public opinion, and since public opinion is made up of individual opinions, and since the teachings of Christ have proved the one great civilising, ennobling, character-building force in the world, it becomes the duty of every man, as a lover of his country and of mankind, to endeavour to obtain right, correct and just opinions, by ascertaining what bearing Christ's teachings have upon the live industrial, political, and social questions of the present day.

"Learn what is true," said Huxley, "in order to do what is right, is the summing up of the whole duty of man."

Without a clear and accurate knowledge of the teachings of Christ upon the great social and industrial questions of to-day, we will be unable to fulfil our highest duties as American citizens; but when grounded in a knowledge of the teachings of the Master, we will be prepared to live as worthy citizens of this great American republic.

[1] *The Influence of Christ in Modern Life*, p. 56.

WAS CHRIST AN ANARCHIST?

WAS CHRIST AN ANARCHIST?

ANARCHY, as a term of political philosophy, has nothing to do with disorder or crime; it is but the logical outcome of that form of political theory known as "individualism."

One of the founders of scientific Anarchy was Rabelais, whose teachings are summed up in the axiom, "Do what you will." He was succeeded in leadership by the Anabaptist Münzer, who declared the principle: "To each one, according to his needs and possibilities." After him came La Boetie who proclaimed the right of the individual to absolute liberty. He was followed by La Fontaine, who enunciated the famous saying: "Our enemy is, the Master"; and it was Diderot who completed it by adding: "Nature has created neither servants nor masters. I wish neither to oppose nor to lend obedience to laws."

It was Max Stirner, however, who first formulated the scattered teachings of anarchy into a complete definite system. His philosophy may be summed up in these words:

"What you have the power to be, that you have the right to be. I derive all right and justification

from myself alone; for I am entitled to everything which I have power to take or to do. I am entitled to overthrow Zeus, Jehovah or God, if I can; if I can not, these gods will always retain their rights and power over me; but I shall stand in awe of their rights and their power in impotent reverence, and shall keep their commands and believe I am doing right in everything that I do, according to their ideas of right, just as a Russian frontier sentry considers himself justified in shooting dead a suspicious person who runs away, because he relies upon a 'higher authority,' in other words, commits murder legally. But I am justified in committing a murder by myself, if I do not forbid it to myself, if I am not afraid of murder in the abstract as of 'something wrong.' I am only not justified in what I do not do of my own free will, that is, that which I do not give myself the right to do. I decide whether the right resides in me; for there is some right external to myself. If it is right to me, then it is right. It is possible that others may not regard it as right, but that is their affair, not mine, and they must take their own measures against it. And if something was in the eyes of the whole world not right, and yet seemed right to me, that is, if I wished it, even then I should ask nothing from the world: thus does everyone who knows how to value himself, and each does it to the extent that he is an egotist, for might goes before right, and quite rightly too. . . . State, religion, and conscience, these despots make me a slave, and their freedom is my slavery."[1]

[1] Quoted from *Anarchism*, by E. V. Zenker, 1897, pp. 113, 114, 118, 119.

Stirner's exposition was enlarged by Pierre Joseph Proudhon who declared that "Governments are the scourge of God," and that there should exist "no government by men by means of the accumulation of power." He claimed that a government should exercise no authority save that of securing to each individual full liberty to do as he may desire, unrestrained by external authority.

Proudhon stopped at defining what he believed to be the ideal state, and it remained for Prince Michael Bakunin to suggest the means for organising an anarchistic society.

"The freedom of man," says Bakunin, "consists solely in following natural laws, because he has recognised them himself as such, and not because they are imposed upon him from without by the will of another, whether divine or human, collective or individual. . . . We reject all legislation, every authority, and every privilege, recognised official and legal influence, even if it has proceeded from the exercise of universal suffrage, since it could only benefit a ruling and exploiting minority against the interests of the great enslaved majority."[1]

In 1869, the "International Alliance of Socialist Democracy" was organised by Bakunin, and in its adopted programme demanded, "the suppression of all political, judicial, and civil, organisations; the substitution of science for faith, and of

[1] Quoted from *Anarchism*, by E. V. Zenker, 1897, p. 156.

human justice for divine; the abolition of creeds and of marriage, in so far as a religious institution; the political and economic equalisation of classes and individuals of both sexes; the abolition of ownership, of inheritance, etc., so that the enjoyment of each one shall be proportionate to his productivity."

In 1871, the Alliance was succeeded by the Federation of the Jura, which, in the platform adopted at its convention in 1876, declared that "no longer does anything exist, neither property nor the state, nor any authority whatsoever," and insisted upon "the necessity of forming a society in which the individual shall no longer depend on any one but himself, his will shall not have any restrictions, and shall not be hampered in any way whatsoever by the will of his fellow men."

The modern school of anarchism places its main emphasis on the principle of destroying all existing laws including, of course, the various forms of government. Peter Kropatkin has stated that all law and dominion, including parliamentary government, must be put aside and be replaced by the "system of no government," and free arrangement.

"Each must retain the right of acting as he thinks best," he says, "and the right of society to punish any one for a social action in any way must be denied. . . . We do not shrink from saying: Do what pleases you! Act as you think fit! for we are convinced that the

great majority of mankind, in proportion to their enlightenment and to the completeness with which they throw off their present fetters, will always act in a manner beneficial to society." "We do not want to be governed! and do we not thereby declare that we ourselves wish to rule no one."[1]

Anarchy, to use the words of Prof. Huxley, is "a state of society in which the rule of each individual by himself is the only government the legitimacy of which is recognised."[2]

"Anarchy is not inconsistent with association, but only with enforced association," declares W. H. Salter. "It means simply a state of society in which no one is bound or obliged to do anything (whether to associate with others or anything else); it is not opposed to order, but only to enforced order, nor to rule, but only to obligatory rule. In other words, it is synonymous with liberty. Under such a system, individuals would simply be left free to do as they chose; compulsion would disappear; the only bonds in society would be moral bonds."[3]

On the other hand, government is an organised force backed by the will of the people; it is the rule of a superior which an inferior is bound to obey; it is "the subjection of the non-invasive individual to an external will."[4]

[1] Quoted from *Anarchism*, E. V. Zenker, 1897, pp. 178, 179.
[2] *Method and Results*, 1906, p. 393.
[3] *Anarchy or Government*, p. 7.
[4] *Instead of a Book*, by B. R. Tucker, p. 233.

Government is "the exercise of authority in the administration of the affairs of a state, community, or society; the authoritative direction and restraint exercised over the actions of men in communities, societies, or states."[1] "It is rule, not only for those who voluntarily submit themselves to it, but for all the members of a community or society. . . . Those subject to it are not free to obey it or not, as they like; they are bound to obey—if not actively, then passively by submitting to physical penalties (for disobedience)."[2]

Anarchy implies a state of absolute liberty and unrestricted freedom wherein the individual may do as he wishes unhampered by any being or power. Government implies the enforced application of rules and regulations to the life and activity of the individual. Anarchy teaches that every man is a king, a czar, an emperor, and free to do as he likes, but at his own peril. Government teaches that every man is subject to a higher power than himself and is free to do only the things which are not specifically denied to him. "Anarchy means the negation of authority"[3]; government means the affirmation of authority.

Was Christ an Anarchist?—Ernest Renan has written: "In one view Jesus was an anarchist,

[1] *Century Dictionary.*

[2] *Anarchy or Government*, by W. N. Salter, pp. 4, 5.

[3] Jean Grave, *La Société mourante et l' Anarchie*, p. 1.

for he had no notion of civil government, which seemed to him an abuse, pure and simple."[1]

Count Leon Tolstoi has said: "The doctrine of humility, pardon, and love, is incompatible with the State, with its arrogance, its deeds of violence, its executions, its wars. Real Christianity not only excludes the possibility of acknowledging the State, but also destroys its foundation." Mr. H. M. Hyndman reached the same conclusion, when he stated: "Christianity is Anarchism."[2]

Christ's attitude toward the government under which He lived was one of acquiescence. He never attempted to overturn the Cæsarian government, or to nullify the laws of the state. The whole organisation around Him, composed of civil servants, fiscal officials, magistrates, officers, and soldiers, not only escaped His condemnation, but was used as the basis of many of His parables which taught the duty of ennobling and purifying the life of the day, and He thereby recognised those things as a part of a just and legitimate law.

"When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make Him a King, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone."[3] At this time, His following was so large and enthusiastic, that He might have organised a party strong enough to have formed

[1] *Life of Jesus*, 23 ed., Boston, 1903, p. 170.
[2] London *Daily Express*, January 14, 1908.
[3] John vi., 15.

so irresistible a force as would have shattered the old order and made Him a dictator of the new order, but He made no such use of His power or of His popularity.

He never opposed the government of Cæsar or encouraged a spirit of rebellion against the Roman power, but when challenged by the Zelotes to say whether or not it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar, He replied: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."[1]

He paid taxes toward the support of the government, though He considered them to be unjust, and at the same time He asserted His right to refuse.[2]

Even Pilate, prejudiced as he was against Christ in the desire to comply with the wish of the mob to find Him guilty of treason, could not be convinced that Christ was a revolutionist.

"Then Pilate entered into the judgment hall again, and called Jesus, and said unto Him, Art thou the King of the Jews? . . . Jesus answered, My Kingdom is not of this world: if my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my Kingdom not from hence. . . . Pilate . . . went out again unto the Jews, and saith unto them, I find in him no fault at all."[3]

[1] Matt. xxii., 17–21.
[2] Matt. xvii., 24–27.
[3] John xviii., 33–38.

Finally, Christ submitted to the mockery of a trial by the government, to the unjust sentence of death pronounced by the government, and to the ignominious death on the cross at the hands of the government.

Not only did Christ submit uncontestingly to the civil government, but He commanded obedience to the laws of the church government. With indignation He said:

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone."[1]

Christ's mission on earth was not to overthrow existing governments or to teach men to destroy government, nor to advocate any specific form of government, but rather, to teach men a way of life to be lived under every form of government, and to establish on earth the "Kingdom of God." This "Kingdom" has as its head a King who is God, and as its subjects those who acknowledge His Kingship, and who submit themselves to its rules and regulations and to its governing force and power. The "Kingdom of God" is an absolute monarchy, more autocratic than any government existing on earth to-day. The "Kingdom" is a government of laws, laws which are imposed

[1] Matt. xxiii., 23.

by a Supreme power on all human beings, who must obey them or suffer the penalties provided for disobedience. The duty of obedience to the laws imposed by God was the constant theme of Christ's preaching. He taught that God is the supreme ruler of the universe and that His laws must be obeyed unquestioningly by every human being.

The basic principle of Christianity is authority; the basic principle of Anarchism is liberty. Christ taught that the life and affairs of men should be governed by the laws of God; Anarchy teaches that the life and affairs of men should be governed by no external authority. Christ taught implicit obedience to a higher law than the individual ego; Anarchy teaches obedience to no law but the will of the individual. Christ, by precept and example, taught obedience to the laws of the State and submission to the decrees of the civil government; Anarchy teaches non-obedience to the laws of the State, and opposition to the decrees of the civil government.

Anarchy and Christianity, therefore, are inherently incompatible, irreconcilable, and antagonistic.

WAS CHRIST A SOCIALIST?

WAS CHRIST A SOCIALIST?

THE claim has often been made that Socialism is Christianity applied to modern social and industrial conditions, and that Jesus Christ was the founder of Socialism.

Rev. R. J. Campbell has written: "The words of Jesus may be fairly regarded as the spiritual presentation of the aims of modern Socialism. . . . Socialism is actually a swing back to the Gospel of the Kingdom of God."[1]

"The Christian ideal is in no way opposed to the socialistic ideal," declares Francisco S. Nitti[2]: while Oscar Holzmann asserts: "There can be no manner of doubt that the fundamental ideals of Socialism are to be referred back to Jesus."[3]

Rev. Eliot White, general secretary of the Christian Socialist Fellowship, recently said: "Socialism is nothing more than the application of the teachings of Christ to industrial conditions"; and Frances E. Willard declared that "Socialism is Christianity applied."

[1] *Christianity and the Social Order*, pp. 19, 147, 173, 279.

[2] *Catholic Socialism*, p. 20.

[3] Cited by Francis G. Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, p. 287.

These statements at once raise the question as to the correct definition of Socialism.

To define the term "Socialism" in such a way as to accord with the views of all who claim to be "Socialists" is a task which is yet to be accomplished.

Despite this unfortunate condition, the fundamental principles of Socialism are easily ascertainable, for they are accepted by all of the past and present day Socialist leaders.

A reform movement, whether social, industrial, or political, is made up of those who believe in its avowed principles, which are embodied in the platforms adopted by its delegates in convention assembled and in the writings of its founders and leaders.

To ascertain the principles which differentiate the Democratic party from all other political parties, an examination must be made of the platforms adopted by its various conventions, and by the spoken and written public utterances of its unquestioned leaders, such as Thomas Jefferson, Samuel J. Tilden, and Grover Cleveland. In like manner, the doctrines of the Republican party are to be found in its platforms and in the spoken and written public utterances of its past and present leaders, Abraham Lincoln, William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and William H. Taft.

To believe in free-trade and at the same time

to call oneself a Republican, or to favour national centralisation of power and profess to be a Democrat, would be sailing under false colours. The fact that some ward politician, or local stump-speaker, or newspaper which is not the official organ of the party, denies some of the party tenets or suggests new measures to be engrafted on the party platform, would in no way bind the party and the acceptance of such utterance alone would not entitle one to bear the name of the party.

Many who call themselves Socialists accept only a few of the fundamental doctrines of the party while they refuse their assent to the remaining tenets. To call oneself a Socialist because of a belief in community of goods, while being opposed to the materialistic and the revolutionary doctrines of the Socialist party, would be as logical as for an atheist, who believes in non-religious social settlements, to attend a Christian church which operates such a settlement, and thereupon call himself a Christian. In order to be a Socialist, one must subscribe to substantially all the fundamental doctrines of the Socialist party.

What is the modern Socialist party, how did it arise, what are its principles, and who are its leaders?

Modern Socialism had its birth in the three plans formulated by Fourier, L'Ange, Buonarotti,

Babeuf and their comrades in 1793–1794, which they endeavoured to put into practice during the French Revolution. One plan was the equalisation of fortunes, by means of a heavily progressive tax and succession duties, by direct confiscation of the land for the purpose of dividing it among the people, and by large war taxes levied only upon the rich. The second plan was the establishment of a national system of prices for all commodities. The third plan was a sort of Municipal Commission which should buy articles of necessity and sell them to the people at cost price.[1]

Shortly after the close of the French Revolution, Charles Fourier, Count Henri de Saint-Simon and Louis Blanc in France, Robert Owen in England, and Karl Rodbertus in Germany, worked out separate theories of social reconstruction and started different socialistic cults. Later, Louis Blanc published his *Organisation of Labour*, and Videl in France and Lorenz Stein in Germany, further developed the socialistic theories. Finally, Karl Marx of Germany, "The giant path-finder of Socialism," correlated the various socialistic theories and worked out a philosophical, social, and economic system which became the basic programme of the present Social Democratic party.

Following Marx, came his pupil and collabora-

[1] Preface to *Conquest of Bread*, by P. Kropatkin, p. v.

tor, Frederick Engels, who aided materially in systematising the Marxian philosophy. After Marx and Engels, the mantle of leadership was placed on the shoulders of August Bebel, William Liebknecht, Karl Kautsky, Ferdinand Lassalle, and Joseph Dietzgen in Germany, Edward Aveling, Belfort Bax, and Robert Blatchford in England, Emil Vandervelde in Belgium, Paul Lafargue, Gabriel Deville, and Jean Jaures in France, Enrico Ferri, Achille Loria and Antonio Labriola in Italy, and A. M. Simons, Isador Ladoff, E. Untermann, Charles H. Vail, R. Rives La Monte, Charles H. Kerr, G. D. Herron, Eugene V. Debs, Morris Hillquit, and J. S. Spargo in the United States.

The Socialist party is an international party as its programme embraces all human society and is world-wide in its application. Being "a world movement"[1] each country necessarily has its leaders, but its platform, advocating, as it does, the obliteration of all boundary lines, is universal and indivisible. To ascertain the teachings of Socialism, the writings of all its leaders, wherever they may reside, must be taken in conjunction with the platforms adopted by its national and international conventions.

The Chicago Platform, adopted by the National Socialist party on May 5, 1904, in its second part, declares: "As an American Socialist party,

[1] Chicago Platform, 1904.

we pledge our fidelity to the principles of international Socialism, as embodied in the united thought and action of the Socialists of all nations."

The People, one of the organs of the Socialist Labour party, in its issue of January 12, 1900, says: "Among the men whom the conditions of the nineteenth century raised up as mouthpieces of the proletarian revolution, two stand pre-eminent—Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. . . . Their writings laid the scientific foundation upon which Socialism is built."[1] This statement is also made by Morris Hillquit and by A. M. Simons.[3]

Morris Hillquit, in the *Worker*, March 23, 1907, wrote:

"Altogether it is high time that the American public abandon the myth of the 'diverse meanings of Socialism' and the 'diverse kinds of Socialism.' There is not and probably never was a theory and movement of more striking uniformity than the theory and movement of Socialism. The International Socialist movement with its thirty million adherents, at a conservative estimate, and its organised parties in about twenty-five civilised countries in both hemispheres, is all based on the same Marxian programme, and follows substantially the same methods of propaganda and action. The 'diverse Socialisms' outside of the organised movement are represented by

[1] Quoted by David Goldstein, *Socialism*, Boston, 1903, p. 186.
[2] *History of Socialism in the United States*, p. 160.
[3] *Int. Soc. Rev.*, June, 1904, p. 725.

small groups of social and political dilettantes toying with problems of the universe and exercising no influence whatever on the course of the International Socialist movement."[1]

Therefore, it is safe to subscribe to the words of the writer in the *Worker*, under date of April 28, 1906:

"There may be fifty-seven varieties, or twice as many, of persons who sometimes call themselves Socialists or are so called by others. But there is only one Socialism that counts in the real world, and it counts for a great deal, for more and more every year. . . . This Socialism that counts, we call it International Socialism, . . . we call it revolutionary Socialism, we call it proletarian Socialism, . . . we call it scientific Socialism."[2]

"Above all else," writes John Spargo, "Socialism is international in its spirit and teaching. There must, necessarily, be differences in the methods employed in countries so far remote from each other in political and economic conditions as Russia and England, or Spain and the United States. But the goal aimed at is in each case the same, and the same principles guide and direct the movement."[3]

The aim of Socialism is to secure to each individual perfect liberty, absolute equality, and

[1] Quoted by Rev. J. J. Ming, *Religion of Modern Socialism*, 2d ed., p. 71.

[2] *Ibid.*, 2d ed., p. 70.

[3] *Forces that make for Socialism*, p. 4.

unhampered opportunity to develop the best and the fullest life possible. All which tends to restrict or limit the opportunities of the individual to live the freest and the most complete life Socialism seeks to change or destroy.

William Liebknecht has written:

"The people should learn by experience that Socialism is not only the regulation of the conditions of labour and of production; that it does not only propose to intervene in the economic functions of the State and of the social organism, but that it aims at the most complete development of the individual and his personality."[1]

Since the claim has been made that Christianity and Socialism are alike in their aims, methods of approach, and ultimate ends, and that "There are many thousands of devoted Christians . . . who are earnest and active Socialists, and who find no antagonism between the essentials of Christian teaching and the essentials of the Marxian philosophy,"[2] the teachings of Christ as found recorded in the four Gospels, and the teachings of Socialism as found in the platforms adopted by the Socialist party and in the writings of its accepted leaders have been collected and are set forth in the following parallel columns in order that their similarity and their difference may be made apparent.

[1] Quoted from *Studies in Socialism*, by Jean Jaures, 1906, p. 91.

[2] *The Spiritual Significance of Modern Socialism*, by John Spargo, pp. 82, 83.

Christ

Mankind is divided into no classes.

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."[1]

"Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."[2]

"Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage."[3]

"And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God."[4]

[1] Mark xvi., 15.
[2] Matt. xi., 28.
[3] Matt. xxii., 9.
[4] Luke xiii., 29.

Socialism

Mankind is divided into two classes—the propertied and the non-propertied, or the capitalist and the proletariat.

Frederick Engels:

"Modern Socialism is, in its essence, the direct product of the recognition, on the one hand, of the class antagonisms, existing in the society of to-day, between proprietors and non-proprietors, between capitalists and wage-workers."[1]

John S. Spargo:

"If the Socialists would repudiate the doctrine that Socialism is a class movement, and make their appeal to the intelligence and conscience of all classes, instead of to the interests of a special class, they could probably double their numerical

[1] *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, 1902, p. 1.

Christ *Socialism*

strength at once. . . . But we should not gain strength as a result of their accession to our ranks. We should be obliged to emasculate Socialism, to dilute it, in order to win a support of questionable value."[1]

"As Socialists, therefore, we do not ask ourselves what Moses or Christ, Buddha or Confucius, Madame Blavatsky or Mrs. Eddy, John Wesley or the Pope would say, but simply this: 'How will it affect the working class to which we belong?' "[2]

[1] *Socialism*, 1909, pp. 151, 152, 153.

[2] *Where We Stand*, Pocket Library of Socialism, No. 52, pp. 21, 22.

Christ

Chief aim is spiritual.

"Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? . . . But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."[1]

"And Jesus, walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers.

"And he saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men.

"And they straightway left their nets, and followed him."[2]

"Lay not up for your-

[1] Matt. vi., 31, 33; Luke xii., 22–31.

[2] Matt. iv., 18–20.

Socialism

Chief aim is materialistic.

The Erfort, Gotha, Vienna, and the Chicago programs, and all the great leaders of the party, declare that the socialisation of property and the means of production are the chief aims of Socialism.

Belfort Bax:

"Socialism is certainly materialistic in so far as it recognises that the first condition of the higher life of humanity is the soundness of its material basis, that without a full and complete satisfaction of the material wants of life for one and all, in other words, without economic equality, the pretence to 'higher life' is no better than an impudent hypocrisy. Herein Socialism differs from all the great ethical religions which have arisen during the his-

Christ

selves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal:

"But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal."[1]

"For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"[2]

"There came unto him a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head as he sat at meat.

"But when his disciples saw it, they had indignation, saying, To what purpose is this waste?

[1] Matt. vi., 19, 20.

[2] Matt. xvi., 26; Luke ix., 25.

Socialism

torical period—from Christianity as much as from any other."[1]

At the grave of his life-long friend Karl Marx, Frederick Engels thus expounded Marx's leading ideas:

"Darwin discovered the law of evolution in organic nature, Marx in the history of mankind. He disclosed the simple fact hidden hitherto by ideological excrescences, the fact that above all else men stand in need of meat and drink, of shelter and clothing, before they can engage in politics, science, art, religion, etc., that therefore the production of the immediate material means of life and the corresponding stage of economic evolution of a nation or epoch forms the foundation from which

[1] *Outspoken Essays*, p. 170.

Christ

"For this ointment might have been sold for much and given to the poor.

"When Jesus understood it, he said unto them, Why trouble ye the woman? for she hath wrought a good work upon me.

"Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her."[1]

"And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word.

"But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? bid her therefore that she help me.

[1] Matt. xxvi., 7–10, 13.

Socialism

the civil institutions of the people in question, their ideas of law, of art, of religion even, have been developed and according to which they are to be explained—and not the reverse, as has been done heretofore."[1]

Robert Rives La Monte:

"At bottom, when we talk intelligently of the Materialistic Conception of History, we simply mean what every man by his daily conduct proves to be true, that the bread-and-butter question is the most important question in life."[2]

Karl Marx:

"In the social production which men carry on, they enter into definite

[1] Mehring, *Die Lessing Legende*, 1893, p. 434.

[2] *Science and Socialism*, Pocket Library of Socialism, No. 22, p. 10.

Christ

"And Jesus answered and said unto her, . . .

"But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her."[1]

"And he said unto them, Take heed, and beware of covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth."[2]

"Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the son of man shall give unto you."[3]

[1] Luke x., 39–42.
[2] Luke xii., 15.
[3] John vi., 27.

Socialism

relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material powers of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitute the economic structure of society—the real foundation, on which rise legal and political superstructures and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political, and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness."[1]

[1] *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, English Trans., N. Y., 1904, p. 11.

Christ *Socialism*

George D. Herron:

"Socialism begins with this—that the history of the world has been economic. The world's sentiments and religions, its laws and morals, its arts and literatures, are all rooted in the struggle between classes for the control of the food supply."[1]

Morris Hillquit:

"The prime concern of men in a state of society is the production of the means for the sustenance of the members of that society."[2]

"The ultimate aim of the socialist movement is to convert the material means into the common property of the nation as the only radical and effective cure of all social evils."[3]

[1] Quoted from *Religion of Socialism* by Ming, p. 184.

[2] *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, 1909, p. 52.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 211.

Christ

Recognises the right of private property.

"And he said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing.

"Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one."[1]

"Sell that ye have, and give alms."[2]

"Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away."[3]

"Jesus said unto him, Zaccheus, . . . to-day I must abide at thy house.

"And Zaccheus stood, and said unto the Lord:

[1] Luke xxii., 35, 36.
[2] Luke xii., 33.
[3] Matt. v., 42; Luke vi., 30.

Socialism

Denies the right of private property.

The N. Y. *Volkszeitung* (Jubilee ed., February 21, 1903, p. 29):

"We affirm our steadfast purpose to use those (governmental) powers, once achieved, to destroy the institution of private property in the means of production and distribution, and to establish the Co-operative Commonwealth."[1]

Jean Jaures:

"The time is not far off when no one will be able to speak to the public about the preservation of private property without covering himself with ridicule and putting himself voluntarily into an inferior rank."[2]

[1] Quoted from *Socialism* by Cathrein, p. 247.
[2] *Studies in Socialism*, 1906, p. 32.

Christ

Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold.

"And Jesus said unto him, This day is salvation come to this house, forsomuch as he also is a son of Abraham."[1]

[1] Luke xix., 5, 8, 9.

Socialism

Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels:

"You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property. . . . In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend."

Karl Marx:

"As the prevailing system is, however, based on the assertion of private ownership, the proletariat feels impelled by society to take up with the opposing principle, namely, the disavowal of private ownership, and will naturally introduce this principle, as essential to its life, into every society where it may acquire that power, which is rapidly and inevitably being achieved."[1]

[1] *Deutsche-Franzosische Jahrbucher*, 1843–44. See article by Marx on "The Hegelian Philosophy of Law."

Christ *Socialism*

"Our teaching may be summed up in this proposition—the abolition of private property."[1]

[1] Mermeix, *Le Socialisme*, 1907, 4th ed., p. 7.

Christ

Forbids stealing.

"And God spake all these words saying:

"Thou shalt not steal."[1]

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.

"For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."[2]

"Jesus said, . . . Thou shalt not steal."[3]

[1] Exodus xx., 1, 15.
[2] Matt. v., 17, 18.
[3] Matt. xix., 18.

Socialist

Advocates stealing.

Eugene V. Debs:

"This great body will sweep into power and seize the reins of government, take possession of industry in the name of the working class—and it can be easily done. All that will be required will be to transfer the title-deeds from the parasites to the producers."[1]

John Spargo:

"The act of transfer, whether it take the form of confiscation or otherwise, must be the will of a legal majority of the people. . . . Of course, in the event of some great upheaval occurring, such as, for example, the rising of a suffering and desperate people in consequence of some terrific panic or period of depression, brought on by capitalist misrule, or by war, this might be swept away."[2]

[1] *Industrial Unionism*, C. H. Kerr & Co., Chicago, p. 32.
[2] *Socialism*, 1909, pp. 331, 332.

Christ

Marriage is an indissoluble contract.

"From the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh: . . . what therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."[1]

"Whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery."[2]

"And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her.

[1] Mark x., 5–9; Matt. xix., 3–6.

[2] Matt. v., 32; Luke vi., 18.

Socialism

Marriage is a temporary contract.

Jean Jaures writes that when the Socialist party shall be in power, it will not "be guilty of rendering marriage a restraining contract of any kind. Each one of the contracting parties will be free to continue to lead the joint life, or will be free to break a bond which may have become galling; for it will be held by society and the laws that when there is no longer any accord or affections or a desire to prolong the common existence, this existence becomes but a lie and should end. . . . Socialist society will hold that it would be hypocrisy or hardness of heart to show any sign of reproval if two such beings sought happiness in another union."[1]

[1] *The Independent*, Aug. 28, 1908, p. 406.

Christ

"And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery."[3]

[3] Mark x., 11, 12; Luke xvi., 18.

Socialism

Robert Rives La Monte:

"From the point of view of this Socialist materialism, the monogamous family, the present economic unit of society, ceases to be a divine institution and becomes the historical product of certain definite economic conditions. It is the form of the family peculiar to a society based on private property in the means of production, and the production of commodities for sale. It is not crystallised and permanent, but, like all other institutions, fluid and subject to change. With the change in its economic basis, the code of sexual morality and the monogamous family are sure to be modified; but, in the judgment of such Socialists as Frederick Engels and August Bebel, we shall probably remain monogamous, but

Christ *Soaicil*

monogamy will cease to be compulsorily permanent."[1]

"Free love is the only kind of love that has ever existed; compulsory or bound love is a contradiction in terms. . . . Socialists do advocate a higher form of marriage in which love will be the only tie, and of which love will be the only sanction. They hold that the cohabitation of loveless couples is the abysmal depth of immorality."[2]

August Bebel:

"This alliance is a private agreement, without the intervention of any (public) functionary. . . . If disagreement, disappointment, or dissatisfaction should arise, morality

[1] *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, 1907, pp. 98, 99.
[2] *Int. Soc. Rev.*, ix., p. 838.

Christ *Socialism*

demands a disruption of the unnatural and, consequently, immoral alliance."[1]

Frederick Engels:

"The indissolubility of marriage is partly the consequence of economic conditions, under which monogamy arose, partly tradition from the time when the connection with the economic situation and monogamy, not yet clearly understood, was carried to extremes by religion. To-day, it has been perforated a hundred times. If marriage founded on love alone is moral, then it follows that marriage is moral only as long as love lasts. The duration of an attack of individual sex-love varies considerably according to individual disposition, especially in men. A positive cessation of fond-

[1] *Die Frau*, p. 342.

Christ *Socialism*

ness or its replacement by a new passionate love makes a separation a blessing for both parties and society."[1]

Karl Kautsky:

"The same phenomena, say of free sexual intercourse or of indifference to property, can in one case be the product of moral depravity in a society where a strict monogamy and the sanctity are recognised as necessary; in another case it can be the highly moral product of a healthy social organism which requires for its social needs neither property in a particular woman nor that (property) in particular means of consumption and production."[2]

[1] *Origin of the Family*, pp. 99, 100.

[2] *Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History*, p. 193.

Christ - *Socialism*

William Morris and Belfort Bax:

"As to the particulars of life under the Socialistic order, we may, to begin with, say concerning marriage and the family that it would be affected by the great change, firstly in economics, and secondly in ethics. The present marriage system is based on the general supposition of economic dependence of the woman on the man, and the consequent necessity for his making provision for her, which she can legally enforce. This basis would disappear with the advent of social economic freedom, and no binding contract would be necessary between the parties as regards livelihood; while property in children would cease to exist, and every infant that came into the world would be born into full citizenship, and would

Christ *Socialism*

enjoy all its advantages, whatever the conduct of its parents might be. Thus a new development of the family would take place on the basis, not of a determined life-long business arrangement, to be formally and nominally held to, irrespective of circumstances, but on mutual inclination and affection, and association terminable at the will of either party."[1]

Edward Carpenter:

"Here there is no solution except the freedom of the woman—which means of course also the freedom of the masses of the people, men and women, and the ceasing altogether of economic slavery. There is no solution which will not include the redemption of the term 'free woman' and 'free-

[1] *The Growth and Outcome of Socialism*, pp. 299, 300.

Christ *Socialism*

love' to their true and rightful significance. Let every woman whose heart bleeds for the sufferings of her sex, hasten to declare herself and to constitute herself, so far as she possibly can, a free woman. Let her accept the term with all the odium that belongs to it, let her insist on her right to speak, dress, think, act and above all to use her sex, as she deems best; let her face the scorn and ridicule; let her 'lose her own life' if she likes; assured that only so can come deliverance, and that only when the free woman is honoured will the prostitute cease to exist."[1]

Charles H. Kerr:

"It is often asked what changes Socialists would make in the marriage

[1] *Love's Coming of Age*, Chicago, 1903, p. 62.

Christ *Socialism*

relation. . . . We would make woman economically free so that she might have no motive for marriage but love, and we would leave people to regulate their private lives for themselves, instead of using the power of the state to coerce them."[1]

George D. Herron:

"I thoroughly believe in the vital and abiding union with one woman as a true basis of the family. But we shall have few such unions until we have a free family. Men and women must be economically free—free from interference of legal and ecclesiastical force, and free to correct their mistakes, before we can have a family that is noble, built on unions that are good. Lives that are essentially one, co-operative

[1] *The Folly of Being "Good,"* pp. 24, 25.

Christ *Socialism*

in the love and truth that make oneness, need no law of state or church to bind or keep them together. Upon such, the imposition of force is a destruction and a blasphemy. On the other hand, no law in the universe has a right to keep together those who are not vitally and essentially one. It is only in free freedom that love can find its own, or truth blossom in the soul, or other than a slave-individuality unfold."[1]

Eugene V. Debs wrote in the *Worker*, April 28, 1906, with reference to Maxim Gorky, who was accompanied to New York by Madam Andreiva as his wife, and who, it was reported, was his mistress only,

[1] *Int. Soc. Rev.*, July, 1901, pp. 23, 24.

Christ *Socialism*

and not his legal consort:

"With open arms and hearts attuned to love and greeting, we of the proletariat welcome Maxim Gorky and his wife to these shores.

"Christ-like is his love for the lowly and despised and his sacrifices of self, and Christ-like his persecution by the heartless pharisees. . . .

"But through all the fiery ideals that have fallen to his lot he has preserved inviolate his mental and moral integrity. . . . No wonder their refined sensibilities are shocked by the advent of genius, healthy, moral and sane, in full possession of all the virtues, nobility of soul, loftiness of mind and purity of heart; no wonder they bar the doors of their harems and hostelries and draw the blinds in

Christ *Socialism*

dread and fear of a fresh and purifying breath of moral atmosphere."[1]

Communist Manifesto:

"The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course, when its complement (prostitution) vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital."[2]

H. M. Hyndman:

"Breaking down and building up go on slowly together, and new forms arise to displace the old. It is the same with the family. That, in the German-Christian sense of marriage for life and responsibility of parents for children born in wedlock, is almost at an end even now, . . . and must

[1] Quoted from *Morality of Modern Socialism*, by John J. Ming, S. J., 1909, pp. 219, 220.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 198, 199.

Christ *Socialism*

result in a widely extended Communism."[1]

Paul Lafargue:

"Freed from the marital yoke and the oppression of man-made morality, woman will be able to develop freely her physical and intellectual faculties."[2]

[1] *The Historical Basis of Socialism*, p. 452.

[2] *Economic Evolution*, Pocket Library of Socialism, No. 56, p. 17.

Christ

Taught the freedom of the human will.

"Whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple."[1]

"So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple."[2]

"And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you."[3]

"But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."[4]

[1] Luke xiv., 28.
[2] Luke xiv., 33.
[3] Luke xi., 9; Matt. vii., 7.
[4] Matt. vi., 33.

Socialism

Denies the freedom of the human will.

Robert Rives La Monte:

"The Marxist absolutely denies the freedom of the will. Every human action is inevitable. 'Nothing happens by chance.' Everything is because it cannot but be. How then can we consistently praise or blame any conduct? If one cares to make hairsplitting distinctions, it may be replied that we cannot, but none the less we can rejoice at some actions and deplore others."[1]

A. Labriola:

"The will does not choose of itself, as was supposed by the inventors of free will."[2]

[1] Quoted *Int. Soc. Rev.*, ix., p. 682.
[2] *Essays on Materialistic Conception of History*, p. 115.

Christ

Human nature can be changed only by a spiritual regeneration.

"O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh."

"A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things."[1]

"Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."[2]

"Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."[3]

[1] Matt. xii., 34, 35.

[2] Matt. xviii., 3; Mark x., 15; Luke xviii., 17.

[3] John iii., 3.

Socialism

Human nature can be changed by changing economic conditions.

E. Untermann:

"Change conditions, and you change human nature. That is the refrain through all the works of proletarian thinkers of modern times."[1]

K. Kautsky:

"Socialism abolishes need and surfeit and all that is unnatural. . . . May we not assume that under these conditions a new type of manhood will evolve which will surpass the highest type which culture has produced up till now?"[2]

[1] *The World's Revolutions*, p. 162.

[2] *On the Morrow of Social Revolution*, p. 43.

Christ

Man's full and complete development depends on his living a Christlike life.

"I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."[1]

"I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."[2]

"Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock:

"And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock."[3]

[1] John x., 10.
[2] John viii., 12.
[3] Matt. vii., 24, 25.

Socialism

Man's full and complete development depends on the introduction of communism.

Jean Jaures:

"When the proletariat has conquered and Communism has been instituted, all the stored-up human effort of centuries will become a sort of supplementary nature, rich and beneficent, which will welcome all human beings from the hour of their birth, and assure to them their full and perfect development."[1]

P. Lafargue:

"The Communist Revolution, by suppressing private property and giving 'to all the same things' will emancipate man."[2]

[1] *Studies in Socialism*, Putnam Sons, 1906, p. 14.
[2] *Social and Philosophical Studies*, p. 92.

Christ

To uplift and ennoble society, the individual must first be uplifted and ennobled.

"Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men."[1]

[1] Matt. v., 13.

Socialism

To uplift and ennoble the individual, society must first be uplifted and ennobled.

Belfort Bax:

"The ethics of Socialism seeks not the ideal society through the ideal individual, but conversely the ideal individual through the ideal society. It finds in an adequate, a free and harmonious social life, at once the primary condition, and the end and completion of individuality."[1]

John S. Spargo:

"In my humble judgment, our friends who talk of solving the social problem by the individual acceptance of an ethical ideal, whether rooted in theological belief or otherwise, are acting as foolishly as if they

[1] *The Ethics of Socialism*, p. 19.

Christ *Socialism*

attempted to build a cathedral from the spire downwards. They are 'placing the cart before the horse' with a vengeance! You might just as well argue that the pyramids of Egypt were built from the apex to the base, as contend that moral regeneration must precede economic change. That is our view."[1]

Karl Marx:

"It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness."[2]

[1] *Where We Stand*, Pocket Library of Socialism, No. 52, p. 5.

[2] *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, English Trans., N. Y., 1904, p. 11.

Christ

Social changes are to be obtained through the enthronement of love, love for God and love for man.

"Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."[1]

"And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these."[2]

[1] Matt. vi., 33.
[2] Mark xii., 30, 31.

Socialism

Social changes are to be obtained only through changed economic conditions.

Frederick Engels:

"The final causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought not in men's brains, not in man's better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange. They are to be sought, not in the philosophy, but in the economics of each particular epoch."[1]

Morris Hillquit:

"The ultimate aim of the Socialist movement is to convert the material means of production and distribution into the common property of the nation as the only radical and effective cure of all social evils."[2]

[1] *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, ed. 1892, p. 45.
[2] *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, 1909, p. 211.

Christ

Taught belief in God.

And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord:

"And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment."[1]

"And Simon Peter answered, and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

"And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."[2]

"Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the

[1] Mark xii., 29, 30.
[2] Matt. xvi., 16, 17.

Socialism

Denies belief in God.

New Yorker Volkszeitung, October, 1901:

"Socialism and belief in God as is taught by Christianity and its adherents are incompatible. Socialism has no meaning unless it is atheistic."[1]

Liebknecht's paper (*Der Volkstaat*) stated in 1875:

"It is our duty as Socialists to root out the faith in God with all our zeal, nor is one worthy of the name who does not consecrate himself to the spread of atheism."[2]

E. Untermann:

"Religious dogma is a survival of the childhood of the race, when men bowed in fear and superstition to the unknown

[1] *Socialism*, Victor Cathrein, p. 320.
[2] J. B. Brooks, *Social Unrest*, New York, 1903, p. 302.

Christ

right hand of the power of God.

"Then said they all, Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am.

"And they said, What need we any further witness? for we ourselves have heard of his own mouth."[1]

"And he saith unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man."[2]

"O righteous Father, the world doth not know thee: but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me.

"And I have declared

[1] Luke xxii., 69–72.

[2] John i., 51.

Socialism

forces of nature and endowed them with human names and qualities. The Manitou of the North American Indian, the Zeus of the Greek, the Jupiter of the Roman, the Jehovah of the Jew and the God of the modern Christian, are all the result of the same feeling of impotence in the face of the elements of nature. They clearly testify to the fact that God was made in the image of man, and not man in the image of God. They are fit subjects for the romantic and ignorant imagination of undeveloped races or of the children of more advanced nations. They are nothing but the heroes of fairy tales by which nations testify to their religious feelings."[1]

[1] *Appeal to Reason*, Feb. 21, 1903.

Christ

unto them thy name, and will declare it."[1]

"Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended unto my Father, but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God and your God."[2]

"After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name."[3]

[1] John xvii., 25, 56.
[2] John xx., 17.
[3] Matt. vi., 4.

Socialism

Belfort Bax:

"Socialism has been well described as a new conception of the world presenting itself in industry as co-operative Communism, in politics as International-Republicanism, in religion as Atheistic Humanism, by which is meant the recognition of social progress as our being's highest end and aim. The establishment of society on a socialistic basis would imply the definitive abandonment of all theological cults, since the notion of a transcendent God or semi-divine prophet is but the counterpart and analogue of the transcendent governing class."[1]

A. Labriola:

"It is to be observed that an opposite point of historic evolution a great

[1] *The Religion of Socialism*, 1902, p. 81.

Christ *Socialism*

number of thinkers of the past century reduced to a simple abstract God, who is a simple regent of the world, all that variegated image of the unknown and transcendental type, developed in so great a wealth of mythological, Christian or pagan creations."[1]

Marx is reported as saying:

"The ideal of God must be destroyed; it is the keystone of a perverted civilisation. The true root of liberty, of equality, of culture, is atheism."[2]

The *Sozial Demokrat*, May 25, 1880:

"When God is driven out of the brain of men, the whole system of privilege by the grace of God comes to the ground, and

[1] *Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History*, p. 218.

[2] *Pall Mall Magazine*, v., p. 680, note.

Christ *Socialism*

when heaven hereafter is recognised as a big lie men will attempt to establish heaven here. Therefore whoever assails Christianity assails, at the same time, monarchy and capitalism."[1]

Robert Rives La Monte:

"Religions, schools of ethics, philosophy, metaphysics, art, political and juridicial institutions are all to be explained in the last analysis by the economic and telluric environments, present and past. This ruthless materialism crushes belief in God, in the soul, in immortality. It leaves no room for any shred of dualism in thought. It is true that the German Social Democracy included in the famous Erfurt

[1] *L'Internationale Rouge*, by Dr. Zacher, translated by Rev. E. M. Geldart, p. 22.

Christ *Socialism*

Programme (adopted in 1891—the first clearly Marxian Socialist platform ever promulgated) a demand for a 'Declaration that religion is a private matter. Abolition of all expenditures from public funds upon ecclesiastical and religious objects. Ecclesiastical and religious bodies are to be regarded as private associations, which order their affairs independently.' It will be seen that this is nothing more than a demand that the State withdraw its sanction of religion as France has recently done in the Clemenceau law. But Ferri does nothing but draw the necessary conclusions from Socialist premises when he writes: 'God, as Laplace has said, is an hypothesis of which exact science has no need; he is, according to Herzen at the most an X, which

Christ *Socialism*

represents now the unknowable—as Spencer and Dubois Raymond contend—but all that which humanity does not yet know. Therefore, it is a variable X which decreases in direct ratio to the progress of the discoveries of science.' "[1]

Paul Lafargue:

"The victory of the proletariat will deliver humanity from the nightmare of religion. The belief in superior beings to explain the natural world and the social inequalities, and to prolong the dominion of the ruling class, and the belief in the posthumous existence of the soul to recompense the inequalities of fate will have no more justification when once man . . . shall live in a communist society from whence shall

[1] *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, 1907, pp. 94, 95.

Christ *Socialism*

have disappeared the inequalities and the injustice of capitalist societies."[1]

Resolution of Pernerstofer, adopted by Austrian Socialists, May 30, 1898:

"We doubt all authority, we know of no immutable dogma, we are champions of right, liberty and conscience."[2]

"At the convention of Spanish Socialists in Madrid, September 21, 1899, it was resolved 'to expel any comrade who supported positive religion.' "[3]

August Bebel:

"We are opposed to every authority, to that of heaven as well as to those

[1] *Int. Soc. Rev.*, Nov., 1903.
[2] Quoted *Socialism*, by Cathrein, p. 219.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 220.

Christ *Socialism*

of earth with which you confront us."[1]

"We aim in the domain of politics at Republicanism; in the domain of economics at Socialism; and in the domain of what is to-day called religion, at Atheism."[2]

Frederick Engels:

"We have simply done with God."[3]

"Nature exists independently of philosophy; it is the basis upon which mankind, itself a product of nature, has grown up; beyond nature and man there is nothing, and these

[1] Speech in Reichstag, Feb. 3, 1893, quoted *Socialism and Christianity*, by Wm. Stang, p. 21.

[2] Dawson's *Lasalle and German Socialism*, p. 286, speech in the Reichstag on March 31, 1881.

[3] Quoted *Socialism and Christianity* by Wm. Stang, p. 21.

Christ *Socialism*

higher beings created by our religious fancy are but the fantastic reflections of our own being."[1]

J. Dietzgen:

"If religion is to be understood as a belief in higher gods and spirits, social democracy has no religion."[2]

[1] *Ludwig Fenerbach*, 2d ed., pp. 10, 11.

[2] *Religion and Social Democracy*, 5th ed., Berlin, 1891, p. 16.

Christ

Enjoins absolute submission to the will of God and implicit obedience to his commands.

Christ prayed: "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done."[1]

"Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me."[2]

"Follow me," was Christ's injunction.[3]

"After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, . . .

"Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."[4]

"Ye are my friends, if

[1] Luke xxii., 42; Matt. xxvi., 39, 42; Mark xiv., 36.
[2] Matt. xi., 29.
[3] Matt. iv., 19.
[4] Matt. vi., 9, 10.

Socialism

Denies the right of God to demand obedience.

Jean Jaures:

"If God himself rose up before us in a palpable form, the first duty of man should be to refuse him obedience and to consider him as an equal with whom one disputes rather than a Master whom one accepts."[1]

August Bebel:

"We are opposed to every authority, to that of heaven as well as to those of earth with which you confront us."[1]

J. Dietzgen:

"Those who start out in life with the belief in an Almighty God and prostrate themselves before the destinies and forces of

[1] Quoted by *The Messenger*, New York, June, 1905, p. 694.
[2] Speech in Reichstag, Feb. 3, 1903, quoted *Socialism* by Victor Cathrein, 1904, p. 238.

Christ

ye do the things which I command you."[1]

"If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments."[2]

[1] John xv., 14.
[2] John xiv., 15.

Socialism

nature and in their piteous feeling of impotency moan for mercy, are anything but efficient members of modern society."[1]

E. Untermann:

"If a supreme being created this world in its beginning, and then left us to ourselves, because we refused to submit to a divine tyrant, so much the worse for him. We have managed to struggle along without his help so long, and can also rise higher without him in the future."[2]

F. Engels:

"In economic life still the saying holds: man proposes, but God (that is the foreign power of capitalistic production) disposes. But when once the

[1] *The Passing of Capitalism*, p. 49.
[2] *Appeal to Reason*, Feb. 21, 1903.

Christ *Socialism*

great social deed will have been accomplished, when, by the seizure and the well—concerned administration of all productive means, society will have rescued itself and its members from servitude, and man will not only propose, but also dispose, then the last foreign power which is still reflected in religion will disappear, and with it also religious reflection will cease, for the simple reason that nothing remains to be reflected."[3]

[3] *Umwälzungen der Wissenschaft*, pp. 304, 306.

Christ

Taught the existence of another world in which God resides.

In the Lord's prayer Christ taught:

"Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven."[1]

"And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."[2]

"In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you."[3]

"Your Father which is in heaven."[4]

[1] Matt. vi., 10; Luke ix., 2.

[2] Matt. xxvi., 19.

[3] John xiv., 2.

[4] Matt. v., 16, 45; vi., 1, 9; vii., 11, 21; x., 32, 33; xii., 50; xvi., 17; xviii., 10, 14, 19.

Socialism

Denies the existence of another world.

Frederick Engels:

"Beyond nature and man there exists nothing."[1]

W. Liebknecht (Feb. 7, 1893):

"The state of the future is a matter of imagination; . . . it is in certain respects an ideal, but science was never concerned about it. Our party has . . . never admitted into its platform the Utopia of a future state; . . . our party has never spoken to the workingmen about the future state, except as about a Utopia."[2]

[1] E. Dühring, *Umwälzungen der Wissenschaft*, 2d ed., p. 11.

[2] Quoted *Socialism*, by Cathrein, p. 239.

Christ

Taught the immortality of the soul.

To the dying thief, Christ said: "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise."[1]

"And Jesus answered and said, verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's;

"But he shall receive . . . in the world to come eternal life."[2]

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."[3]

"And they shall come from the east, and from

[1] Luke xxiii., 43.

[2] Mark x., 29, 30; Matt. xix., 29; Luke xviii., 26, 30.

[3] Matt. xxv., 46.

Socialism

Denies the immortality of the soul.

Paul Lafargue:

"The idea of the soul and its survival is an invention of the savages who allowed themselves an immaterial and immortal spirit to explain the phenomena of dreams,"[1]

Belfort Bax:

"The moment this belief in after-death existence is erected into a dogma, the moment it comes to be looked upon as an article of faith which it is a duty to hold, or at least which it is the evidence of an ignoble disposition of mind not to hold, then it becomes an enemy to be combated."[2]

[1] *Social and Philosophical Studies*, Trans. by C. Kerr, Chicago, 1906, p. 12.

[2] *Ethics of Socialism*, London, 1902, p. 196.

Christ *Socialism*

the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God."[1]

"Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.

"And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."[2]

[1] Luke xiii., 29.
[2] John xi., 25, 26.

Christ

Teaches the blessedness of the other world.

"Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."[1]

"Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven."[2]

[1] Matt. xxv., 34.
[2] Luke x., 20.

Socialism

Despises the other world.

Belfort Bax:—

"In what sense Socialism is not religion will now be clear. It utterly despises the other world with all its stage properties, that is, the present objects of religion."[1]

The *Sozial Demokrat*, May 25, 1880:

"When God is driven out of the brain of men, the whole system of privilege by the grace of God comes to the ground, and when heaven hereafter is recognised as a big lie men will attempt to establish heaven here. Therefore whoever assails Christianity assails, at the same time, monarchy and capitalism."[2]

[1] *Religion of Socialism*, p. 52.
[2] *L'Internationale Rouge*, by Dr. Zacher, translated by Rev. E. M. Geldart, p. 22.

Christ

Only through the mercy of God can man be redeemed.

"And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved?

"And Jesus looking upon them saith, With men it is impossible, but not with God: for with God all things are possible."[1]

"And Jesus walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers.

"And He saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men.

"And they straightway left their nets, and followed Him."[2]

[1] Mark x., 26, 27; Matt. xix., 26, 27; Luke xviii., 26, 27.

[2] Matt. iv., 18–20.

Socialism

Work is the only redeemer of man.

J. Dietzgen:

"Work is the name of the New Redeemer."

"Conscious, systematic organisation of social labour is the redeemer of modern times."[1]

A. Bebel;

"No man, no God in human form, no Saviour, can redeem humanity. Only humanity itself—only labouring humanity—can save humanity."[2]

"To make his living the priest will be obliged to work, and learning thereby he will finally come to the conviction that to be the highest is to be a man."[3]

[1] *Philosophical Essays*, pp. 94, 101.

[2] Quoted by Cathrein, *Socialism*, p. 213.

[3] *Die Frau*, p. 320.

Christ

Taught the permanency of religion.

"Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away."[1]

[1] Luke xxi., 33.

Socialism

Teaches the transitoriness of religion.

Enrico Ferri:

"Socialism does not feel the necessity of waging a special war against these religious beliefs, which are destined to disappear. It has assumed this attitude, although it knows the absence or impairment of the belief in God is one of the most powerful factors for its extension.

"Socialism knows and foresees that religious beliefs, whether one regards them with Sergi as pathological phenomena of human psychology, or as useless phenomena of moral incrustation, are destined to perish by atrophy with the extension of even elementary scientific culture."[1]

[1] *Socialism and Modern Science*, p. 63.

Christ *Socialism*

J. Dietzgen:

"The progress or development of religion consists in its gradual dissolution. . . . Where man becomes conscious of his task, where he recognises in himself the absolute organiser, there the place of the religious conception is taken by the anti-religious social democracy."[1]

Belfort Bax:

"Our ideal will cease to have for its object God and 'another world' and be brought back to its original sphere of social life and this world."

"The devotion of the member of the socialised community, like the devotion of all true Socialists to-day, will be based on science and involve no cults."[2]

[1] *Philosophical Essays*, pp. 118, 121.

[2] *Religion of Socialism*, pp. 36, 52.

Christ *Socialism*

A. Loria:—

"Only with the advent of this final social form will the idea of an irresistible power, superior to the forces surrounding mankind, ultimately disappear, and therewith also the religious sentiment, which is its natural corollary."[1]

Karl Marx:—

"The abolition of religion as the deceptive happiness of the people is a necessary condition of their happiness." "Religion will vanish with the change of the unjust economic conditions, with the passing of capitalist production on which it rests."[2]

Frederick Engels:

"Religion is nothing

[1] *Economic Foundations*, p. 24.

[2] *Capital*, London, 1902, p. 51.

Christ *Socialism*

but the fantastic reflection in the brains of men of those powers by whom their daily existence is dominated, a reflection in which the natural forces assume supernatural forms.

"The forces of nature are now known to a great extent. The only basis of religious reflex action yet remaining are the economic conditions, by which man feels himself ruled as by a foreign power. In economic life still the saying holds: man proposes but God (that is the foreign power of capitalistic production) disposes. But when once the great social deed will have been accomplished, when, by the seizure and the well-converted administration of all productive means, society will have rescued itself and its members from servitude, and man will not only propose, but

Christ *Socialism*

also dispose, then the last foreign power which is still reflected in religion will disappear, and with it also religious reflection will cease, for the simple reason that nothing remains to be reflected. Then religion will die a natural death."[1]

August Bebel:

"Religion is the transcendental reflection of the social conditions of given epochs. In the measure that human development advances, and society is transformed, religion is transformed along with it."[2]

P. Lafargue:

"The victory of the proletariat will deliver humanity from the night-

[1] E. Dühr ungs *Umwälzungen der Wissenschaft*, 2d ed., pp. 11, 304, 306.

[2] Quoted by Goldstein, *Socialism*, p. 137.

Christ *Socialism*

mare of religion. The belief in superior beings to explain the natural world and the social inequalities and to prolong the dominion of the ruling class, in the posthumous existence of the soul, to recompense the inequality of fate, will have no more justification when once man, who has already grasped the general cause of the phenomena of nature, shall live in a communist society from whence shall have disappeared the inequalities and the injustice of capitalistic society."[1]

Robert Rives La Monte:

"Socialist parties do not attack Religion, the Family or the State. But Socialist philosophy proves conclusively that the realisation of the pos-

[1] *Int. Soc. Rev.*, Nov., 1903, p. 293.

Christ *Socialism*

itive political and economic ideals of Socialism involves the atrophy of Religion, the metamorphosis of the Family, and the suicide of the State."[1]

[1] *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, 1907, p. 89.

Christ

The State should be upheld.

"And Jesus answering said unto them, Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's."[1]

"And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay tribute?

"He saith, Yes. And when he had come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers?

"Peter saith unto him, of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free.

"Notwithstanding, lest

[1] Mark xii., 17; Matt. xxii., 21; Luke xx., 25.

Socialism

The State should be abolished.

Frederick Engels:

"We are now rapidly approaching a stage of evolution in production in which the distinction of classes has not only ceased to be a necessity, but becomes a positive fetter to production. Hence these classes must fall as inevitably as they once arose. The State must irrevocably fall with them. The society that is to reorganise production on the basis of a free and equal association of the producers, will transfer the machinery of the State where it will then belong, into the Museum of Antiquities by the side of the spinning wheel and the bronze axe."[1]

Communist Manifesto—Part II:

"When in the course of

[1] *Origin of the Family*, p. 211.

Christ

we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money; that take and give unto them for me and thee."[1]

"And the whole multitude of them arose, and led him unto Pilate.

"And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a King.

"And Pilate, when he had called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people,

"Said unto them, Ye have brought this man unto me, as one that perverteth the people: and, behold, I, having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man

[1] Matt. xvii., 24–27.

Socialism

development, class distinctions have disappeared and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so called, is merely the organised power of one class for oppressing the other. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeois is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organise itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution it makes itself the ruling class, and as such sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms, and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class."[1]

[1] Quoted *Morality of Modern Socialism*, by John J. Ming, S. J., 1909, p. 298.

Christ

touching those things whereof ye accuse him:

"No, nor yet Herod: for I sent you to him; and, lo, nothing worthy of death is done unto him."[1]

[1] Luke xxiii., 1, 2, 13–15

Socialism

August Bebel:

"The State is the inevitable necessary organisation of a civil order that rests upon class rule. The moment class organisations fall through the abolition of private property, the State loses both the necessity and the possibility for its existence. With the removal of the conditions of rulership, the State gradually ceases to be, the same as creeds wane when the belief ceases in supernatural beings or in transcendental powers gifted with reason. Words must have sense; if they lose that, they cease to convey ideas."[1]

Robert Rives La Monte:

"It is thus seen that, according to the teaching of historical materialism,

[1] *Woman*, p. 272. See also p. 318.

Christ *Socialism*

the State is destined, when it becomes the State of the working-class, to remove its own foundation—economic inequality—and thus to commit suicide."[1]

[1] *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, p. 113.

Christ

Opposed to the use of violence to accomplish His ends.

"Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.

"Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?

"And they that had laid hold on Jesus led him away to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the elders were assembled."[1]

"And one of them smote the servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear.

"And Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye thus far. And he touched his ear, and healed him."[2]

[1] Matt. xxvi., 52, 53, 57; John xviii., 10, 11.

[2] Luke xxii., 50, 51.

Socialism

Advocates the use of violence to accomplish its ends.

"Marx declared at the Congress of The Hague:

"In most countries of Europe violence must be the lever of our social reform. We must finally have recourse to violence in order to establish the rule of labour. . . . The revolution must be universal, and we find a conspicuous example in the Commune of Paris, which has failed because in other capitals—Berlin and Madrid—a simultaneous revolutionary movement did not break out in connection with this mighty upheaval of the proletariat in Paris."[1]

"We are ruthless and want no consideration from you (the bourgeoisie).

[1] Quoted *Socialism* by Victor Cathrein, 7th German ed. 1904, p. 209.

Christ *Socialism*

When our turn comes, revolutionary terrorism will not be sugar-coated. . . . There is but one way of simplifying, shortening, concentrating the death agony of the old society as well as the bloody labour of the new world's birth—revolutionary Terror."[1]

"Bebel, commenting in the German Reichstag upon occurrences in Paris, says:

"'These events are but a slight skirmish in the war which the proletariat is prepared to wage against all palaces.' On another occasion he declares that this reform cannot be brought about by sprinkling rosewater. In one of his works, *Unsere Ziele*, p. 44, he writes as follows, on the application of violence: 'We must not

[1] *Die Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 301, May 19, 1849.

Christ *Socialism*

shudder at the thought of the possible employment of violence; we must not raise an alarm-cry at the suppression of "existing rights," at violent expropriation, etc. History teaches that at all times new ideas, as a rule, were realised by a violent conflict with the defenders of the past, and that the combatants for new ideas struck blows as deadly as possible at the defenders of antiquity. Not without reason does Karl Marx, in his work on *Capital*, exclaim: "Violence is the obstetrician that waits on every ancient society which is about to give birth to a new one; violence is in itself a social factor."[1]

[1] Quoted *Socialism* by Cathrein, 7th German ed. 1904, p. 209.

Christ *Socialism*

"At the Socialist convention of Ghent (1877) Liebknecht exclaimed:

"'The army will after all consist of sons of the people whom we are gaining over by our revolutionary propaganda. . . . When the day shall have arrived, rifles and cannons will of their own accord face about to prostrate the foes of the Socialist people.'"[1]

Enrico Ferri:

"The process of social transformation, as well as—under varied names—those of every sort of transformation in living organisms are: evolution, revolution, rebellion, individual violence."[2]

Charles H. Kerr:

"As to the means by

[1] Quoted by Cathrein, *Socialism*, p. 210.

[2] *Socialism and Modern Science*, trans. by R. R. La Monte, 1904, p. 138.

Christ *Socialism*

which the capitalist class is to be overthrown, the real question worth considering is what means will prove most effective. If it could best be done by working for 'one thing at a time' and bidding for the votes of the people who have no idea what the class-struggle means, we should no doubt favour that method. But history has made it very clear that such a method is a dead failure. . . . If, on the other hand, the working-class could best gain power by taking up arms, just as the capitalist class did when it dislodged the land-holding nobility from power, why not?"[1]

Joseph Dietzgen:

"O ye short-sighted and narrow-minded, who cannot give up the fad of the modern organic progress!

[1] *What to Read on Socialism*, Nov., 1906, Chicago, p. 10.

Christ *Socialism*

Don't you perceive that all our great liberal passions sink to the level of mere trifling, because the great question of social salvation is on the order of the day? Don't you perceive that struggle and destruction must precede peace and construction, and that chaotic accumulation of material is the necessary condition of systematic organisation, just as the calm precedes the tempest and the latter the general purification of the air? . . . History stands still, because she gathers force for a great catastrophe."[1]

Belfort Bax:

"But the sudden expropriation, in other words, the revolutionary crisis, will have to be led up to by a series of non-revolutionary political acts. . . .

[1] *Philosophical Essays*, pp. 99, 100.

Christ *Socialism*

When that crisis comes the great act of confiscation will be the seal of the new era."[1]

Morris Hillquit:

"And similarly silent is the Socialist programme on the question whether the gradual expropriation of the possessing class will be accomplished by a process of confiscation or by the method of compensation. The greater number of Socialist writers incline towards the latter assumption, but in that they merely express their individual present preferences. Social development, and especially social revolutions, are not in the habit of consulting cut and dried theories evolved by philosophers of past generations, and social justice is more frequently a question of social expediency and

[1] *Ethics of Socialism*, p. 82.

Christ *Socialism*

class power. The French clergy was not compensated for the lands taken from it by the bourgeois revolution, and the Russian noblemen and American slave owners were not compensated upon the emancipation of their serfs and chattel slaves. It is not unlikely that in countries in which the social transformation will be accomplished peacefully, the State will compensate the expropriated proprietor, while every violent revolution will be followed by confiscation. The Socialists are not much concerned about this issue. Their aim is the establishment of a State in which exploitation of man by man shall become impossible, and when private wealth has been robbed of the character of employing and exploiting capital, its possession by a number

Christ *Socialism*

of individuals ceases to be a menacing factor in a Socialist State."[1]

[1] *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, 1909, pp. 103, 104.

The foregoing quotations are a few characteristic samples taken from the socialistic teachings of the founders and of the contemporaneous leaders of the cause, and do not by any means comprise the entire literature on these phases of the subject. This entire volume could be filled with like or similar statements from other past and present-day leaders of Socialism in Europe and America.

The quotations seem to indicate that the teaching of Christ and the teaching of Socialism are absolutely and irreconcilably antagonistic. That the leaders of Socialism have reached this conclusion we may gather from their written statements.

Isador Ladoff says: "To combine the terms Christianity and Socialism is just as sensible as to combine the terms Anarchism and Socialism. One excludes the other as its antithesis, as its negation."[1]

Edward Aveling, in *To-day* writes:

"Whether anything is done or nothing is done, little that is of any real lasting value can be done until men and women fairly face the fact that the terrible condition of our poor is due, as are so many other ills, to the two curses of our country and times. These two curses are Capitalism and Christianity. . . . I know that Christianity and Capitalism support and are supported by each other. They are Siamese twins. They live, they die together. A blow at one is a blow at both. Christianity is a pander to

[1] *The Passing of Capitalism*, p. 49.

Capitalism, bringing to it for prey the fair virgin called Labour, beguiled by the hope of a beautiful hereafter.

"In Christianity we see not only a supporter of the greatest evils, but a system that by its fundamental principles vitiates human thoughts and distracts the attention of mankind from the natural and actual. Against these, Christianity and Capitalism, therefore, we fight. So indissoluble are these two, so absolutely does the happiness of the future race depend on their downfall, that we re-echo with a modification the cry of Voltaire, 'Ecrasez L'infâme.' "[1]

G. D. Herron says:

"Christianity to-day stands for what is lowest and basest in life. The Church of to-day sounds the lowest note in human life. It is the most degrading of all our institutions, and the most brutalising in its effects on common life. The Church is simply organised Christianity. For Socialism to use it, to make terms with it, or to let it make approaches to the Socialist movement is for Socialism to take Judas to its bosom."[2]

Belfort Bax writes:

"It is useless blinking the fact that the Christian doctrine is more revolting to the higher moral sense of to-day than the Saturnalia or the cult of Prosperine could have been to the conscience of the early Christians. And more than this, the social and humanistic tendencies of the age, the consciousness of human

[1] Quoted by Goldstein, *Socialism*, pp. 26, 27.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

welfare and human development as 'our being's' end and aim, as the sole object worthy of human devotion, must instinctively shrink from its antithesis, the theological spirit, and this despite the emasculated free Christian and theistic guise in which the latter may appear at present. 'Ye cannot serve God and humanity,' is the burden of the nobler instincts of our epoch."[1]

E. Ferri in the *Avanti*, writes: "The civilisation of social democracy will never befoul itself with Christianity."[2]

The *Sozial Demokrat* says:

"Christianity is the greatest enemy of Socialism. When God is expelled from human brains, what is called the Divine Grace will at the same time be banished; and when the heaven above appears nothing more than an immense falsehood, men will seek to create for themselves a heaven below."[3]

James Leatham, testifies:

"At the present moment I cannot remember a single instance of a person who is at one and the same time a really earnest and intelligent Socialist and an orthodox Christian. Those who do not openly attack the Church and the fabric of Christianity show but scant respect to either one or the other in private. . . . And while all of us are thus indifferent to the Church,

[1] *Ethics of Socialism*, pp. 46, 47.
[2] Quoted by Goldstein, *Socialism*, p. 25.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 116.

many of us are frankly hostile to her. Marx, Lasalle, and Engels among earlier Socialists, Morris, Bax, Hyndman, Guesce, and Bebel among present-day Socialists, are all more or less avowed atheists, and what is true of the notable men of the party is almost equally true of the rank and file the world over."[1]

Joseph Dietzgen has written:

"Socialism and Christianity differ from each other as the day does from the night. To be sure, there are points of resemblance between them. But show me the thing to which no analogy could be found. . . . Though Christianity and Socialism may have some points in common, it is none the less true that whoever mistakes Christ for a Socialist is purely a dangerous muddlehead."[2]

Since the teachings of Christ and the doctrines of Socialism are antagonistic, it follows as a natural sequence that Socialism, in order to achieve its goal, must blot out from the minds of men belief in God and loyalty to Christ, and must uproot and obliterate the Christian Church from off the face of the earth.

The Erfurt Programme of 1891 declares its main principle to be

"the transformation of private capitalistic property in the means of production—*i.e.*, land, mines and mining, raw materials, tools, machinery, and means of

[1] Quoted by Goldstein, *Socialism*, p. 95.
[2] *Philosophical Essays*, p. 122.

communication—into common property, and the change of private production into socialistic."

The Programme further states:

"Religion is to be declared a private concern; the use of public funds for ecclesiastical and religious purposes to be abolished. Ecclesiastical and religious communities are to be regarded as private societies which are perfectly free to manage their own affairs."

If all property is owned by the social body and religion is a "private concern" and "the use of public funds for ecclesiastical and religious purposes (is) to be abolished," then all churches, religious meeting places, theological seminaries, and religious schools must consequently be abolished and religion be a personal "private concern" between the individual and any higher power in whom he may believe.

August Bebel wrote in the *Vorwarts* in 1901:

"We must wage an unrelenting war against the Church, because she foments civil war among the workers. We must take away from her her control over public education, which she uses to corrupt children, who would otherwise become Socialists. We must fight her without weakness, for she is the only power which has dogmas, hierarchies, riches, and agents who systematically attack us. We must attack her because her economies, her politics, her ethics are contrary to our ideal."

E. Vandervelde asks: "Can a sincere believer

follow the Church and yet be a Socialist? . . . We are bound to admit that both in philosophy and in politics there must be war between Socialism and the Church."[1]

E. Untermann declares:

"It is only the class-conscious proletariat which knows its enemies in church and state, which combats them uncompromisingly, and which will finally overcome them. . . . And when the day of judgment arrives, as it surely will, the church of the ruling classes will fall with the systems which they supported, and the ancient and medieval revolutionaries will beckon to us out of the past and say: 'It is well.' "[2]

Was Christ a Socialist? The answer to this question is summed up in the words of August Bebel, the present leader of International Social Democracy: "Christianity and Socialism stand toward each other as fire and water."[3]

[1] Quoted by Goldstein, *Socialism*, pp. 133, 135.
[2] *The World's Revolutions*, p. 103.
[3] Quoted from *Socialism and Christianity*, by Wm. Stang, p. 20.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

THE term "Kingdom of God" was peculiar to the religious belief of the Hebrew people. Its original import was clear and definite, but its significance was altered from time to time, thus vividly reflecting the intellectual development of the race, their enlarging conception of Jehovah, and their changing attitude toward life.

The initial conception of the Hebrew people as to the "Kingdom of God" was that Israel composed such Kingdom, that Jehovah, though invisible to human sight, was the real King; that the "Kingdom" was restricted to the Hebrew people, and that Jehovah ruled over them as an absolute monarch over his subjects. Their judges or kings were considered as representatives of Jehovah; their prophets, as mouthpieces or spokesmen of Jehovah; and their whole system of laws and institutions, as the direct expression of the will of Jehovah.

Their second conception of the "Kingdom" developed when afflictions and tribulations were visited upon them, their prophets having declared that these troubles were imposed by Jehovah because they had fallen away from righteous living. The "Kingdom" then became limited to include

only those members of the Hebrew race who led righteous lives and who adhered closely to the prescriptions of Hebrew law and tradition.

Their third conception of the "Kingdom" arose out of the dire oppression to which the nation had been subjected in the latter part of its existence under the Syrian and Roman dominations. This later view was that the "Kingdom" had not as yet been established, but that it would be ushered in on earth in the near future, when the foreign yoke would be broken, when there would be national emancipation from foreign powers, and when there would be set up a new and divine Israelitish state, a world empire, with Palestine the seat of the capital, of which the expected Messiah would be the supreme ruler; all Hebrews, the members; all governments, tributary; and all people, subjects.

A fourth conception of the "Kingdom" developed in the thoughts of a few of the spiritually minded of the Hebrew people, it being an apocalyptic view,—that after death the righteous Hebrews would enter an abode beyond the stars, there to live for ever with Jehovah in His everlasting Kingdom.

At the time of the coming of Christ, the third and fourth conceptions of the "Kingdom" were the ones most commonly held by the Hebrew people. The more worldly, those who constituted the great majority of the race, held to the third view,

while the few esthetics believed in the fourth, or other worldly idea.

At that time the most characteristic trait in the life and thought of the Hebrew people was their intense and enthusiastic belief in the coming of a golden age, a glorious period of power, prosperity and happiness. They confidently expected that the "Kingdom of God" would soon be established; that it would be ushered in by a startling catastrophe, such as the blaze of a meteor,[1] as a signal intervention of God in human history; that the Messiah clothed in earthly splendor and manifested in the pomp of victory, would suddenly appear, beat down His enemies and establish His throne in power and grandeur.

John the Baptist, a latter day Elijah, the forerunner of Christ, vigorously protested against the materialism of the prevailing ideas concerning the nature of the "Kingdom," and preached repentance as a preparation for the coming of the "Kingdom" which he announced was close at hand. He declared that only the righteous were to become members of the "Kingdom," and that the unrighteous Hebrew could no more become a member of the "Kingdom of God" than could a non-member of the Hebrew race.

The clarion tones of this remarkable preacher thrilled the subjected nation and aroused the patriotism which slumbered in the hearts of the people.

[1] Luke xvii., 20, 21

His words of cheer and of hope recalled to the minds of the Hebrew people the visions of their prophets, and while their imaginations were quickened, their longings intensified and their ambitions stimulated, Jesus Christ appeared with the long-looked-for message: "The time is fulfilled; the Kingdom of God is now close at hand; repent and believe in the good news."[1]

The "Kingdom of God" was the central thought of all Christ's teachings, the predominating theme of His Gospel. "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the Kingdom."[2] The subject of His teaching to His disciples was "the mysteries of the Kingdom,"[3] and they were "instructed unto the Kingdom."[4] His commission to the twelve apostles was, "As ye go, preach, saying the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."[5] The seventy whom He sent out were to declare, "The Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you."[6]

During the interval between His resurrection and ascension, He was still "speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God."[7] The message which His followers were to carry to all people was: "And this gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world."[8]

The terms "Kingdom of God" and "Kingdom

[1] Mark i., 15. [2] Matt. iv., 23. [3] Matt. xiii., 11.
[4] Matt. xiii., 52. [5] Matt. x., 7 [6] Luke x., 1–11.
[7] Acts i., 3. [8] Matt. xxiv., 14.

of Heaven," as used by Christ, mean practically one and the same thing.

Christ took the hope as He found it. He did not need to define the term "Kingdom of God" as it was universally known among the Hebrew people; but He gave to it a new meaning.

He first urged the supreme claim of the "Kingdom" over all other temporal claims, and held forth the glorious promise to those who should accept His teaching: "But seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."[1]

In Christ's teaching, the "Kingdom of God" had a threefold reference:

1. *An immanent, spiritual presence in the human heart.*

When men wanted to see a material Kingdom of God, to locate it, and to point it out as something definite before the eyes of all, Christ declared: "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, there! for lo, the Kingdom of God is within you."[2] And again "The Kingdom of God is come upon you."[3]

2. *A present state.*

When the Pharisees asked Christ when the "Kingdom" would come He replied: "Lo, the Kingdom is in the midst of you."[4] On another

[1] Matt. vi., 33; Luke xii., 31.
[2] Luke xvii., 20, 21.
[3] Matt. xii., 28.
[4] Luke xvii., 21.

occasion, He declared: "There be some here of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste death, till they see the Kingdom of God come with power."[1] At another time, He said: "If I by the finger of God cast out evil spirits, then has the Kingdom of God come upon you."[2]

The theme of daily prayer which Christ urged on His followers was: "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in Heaven."[3]

3. *A future state.*

"My Kingdom is not of this world,"[4] Christ specifically stated.

"Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth . . . see the son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."[5]

"Verily, I say unto you I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the Kingdom of God."[6]

"And I say unto you, that many shall come from the East and West and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the Kingdom of heaven."[7]

What Christ meant by these three seemingly inconsistent and antagonistic definitions of the "Kingdom of God," will be more apparent when the fundamental principles of the "Kingdom," as stated by Christ, are reviewed.

[1] Mark ix., 1; Luke ix., 27. [2] Luke xi., 20 Matt. xii., 28.
[3] Matt. vi., 10. [4] John xviii., 36. [5] Matt. xxiv., 30.
[6] Mark xiv., 25; Luke xxii., 18. [7] Matt. viii., 11.

The four corner-stones of the "Kingdom" are as follows:

1. *The Fatherhood of God.*

Christ taught His disciples, "After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven."[1] He declared unto them: "And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any; that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses."[2] Again He said: "If ye then, being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?"[3] "Jesus saith unto her, . . . go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and to my God, and your God."[4]

As God is the Father of all, the attitude of the child toward his Father should be that of complete love; as Christ declared: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment."[5]

2. *The Brotherhood of Man.*

God being the Father of all mankind, His children therefore are brothers. As to the duty entailed on such relationship, Christ said: "A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you."[6] Again, He

[1] Luke xi., 2. [2] Mark xi., 25. [3] Luke xi., 13.
[4] John xx., 17. [5] Mark xii., 30. [6] John xiii., 34.

commanded: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."[1]

3. *Childlikeness of Spirit.*

Christ asserted that the humbleness of spirit, the sincerity of motive, the gentleness of character, and the recognition of no difference of race, or colour, or creed, and of no social distinctions, which are the qualities of childhood, are essential qualifications of a citizen of the "Kingdom."

"And Jesus called a little child unto Him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven."[2] On another occasion, Christ said: "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the Kingdom of God."[3]

Once when the disciples were quarrelling over the question of precedence, Christ took a little child, placed him in the midst of them, and said: "This is the greatest: whoever shall humble himself as this little child, he is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven."[4]

4. *Serviceableness.*

Christ said: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven: but he that doeth the will of my Father

[1] Mark xii., 31. [2] Matt. xviii., 2, 3.
[3] Mark x., 14, 15; Luke xviii., 16, 17; x., 21; Matt. xi., 25.
[4] Matt. xviii., 4; Mark ix., 33–36; Luke ix., 46–48.

which is in Heaven."[1] "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."[2]

As the law of service was binding on the Master, it is equally binding on the disciple.

Christ declared that the "Kingdom" was not the peculiar property of Israel, but that it was a world-wide Kingdom, open to all mankind, without regard to sex, age, station, or race.

No man belongs to the "Kingdom" solely because he is a Jew, or is excluded from it simply because he is a Gentile.

"Therefore, I say unto you, the Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."[3]

"The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a net, that was cast unto the sea, and gathered of every kind."[4]

"And I say unto you, that many shall come from the East and the West, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the Kingdom of Heaven."[5]

"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."[6]

[1] Matt. vii., 21. [2] Matt. xx., 26–28; Mark x., 42–44.
[3] Matt. xxi., 43. [4] Matt. xiii., 47. [5] Matt. viii., 11.
[6] Mark xvi., 15.

ADMISSION TO THE "KINGDOM."—Christ declared that God is the Father of all mankind. If men and women are God's children, at birth, they become citizens of His "Kingdom," in somewhat the same way as a child born in the United States becomes, by virtue of his birth, a citizen of this Republic.

It is true, that an infant has no comprehension of his birthright, and that his development into a worthy citizen is dependent largely upon his early training; yet, his birthright cannot be taken from him or his citizenship be lost, save through his own voluntary act, when he reaches an age believed to be synonymous with discretion.

Citizenship, whether of an earthly state or of the "Kingdom of God," is of but little value to the citizen who neglects to exercise the privileges and to perform the duties attendant thereon.

A man born in the United States and thereby an heir to the rich heritage of American citizenship, who fails to exercise the privileges and to perform the duties of a citizen, will still reap certain benefits due to his birth on American soil, but he will gain none of the blessings which come to those who live as true and loyal citizens. Until he formally declares his citizenship, publicly exercises the privileges, and faithfully performs the duties of a citizen, he is, in reality, but a citizen in name. The birthright of American citizenship is the privilege accorded to an individual of grow-

ing into a strong, well-rounded man and an honoured, useful citizen.

In an analogous manner, a citizen of the "Kingdom of God" who fails to keep close to Christ and neglects his duties as a citizen is only a little better off than he who has renounced his citizenship and transferred his allegiance to some other sovereign.

A citizen of the United States may voluntarily give up his citizenship and become a subject of some other nation. So, also, a citizen of the "Kingdom of God" is free to give up his birthright and to become a subject of the money-god, the god of power, the god of pleasure, or the many-headed god of sin.

As the United States Government permits a former citizen who has transferred his allegiance to some other nation to again become one of its citizens, so also does the Almighty allow a citizen of the "Kingdom," who has forsaken his God and given his allegiance to some other master, to become reinstated as a citizen of the "Kingdom" he had renounced.

It matters not how far away from the life of the "Kingdom" one may have wandered, or to what power he may have transferred his allegiance, or how low he may have sunk in degradation, even though he may have come to live and to eat with swine, he is still eligible to reinstatement as a citizen of the "Kingdom."

The parable of the Prodigal Son[1] illustrates this truth and indicates the way by which a man may become reinstated as a citizen of the "Kingdom."

The Prodigal Son took his patrimony and went away from his father's house and journeyed into a far country and spent his substance in riotous living, but even though he had abused his birthright and forsaken his father, he did not forfeit his privilege of resuming his former place in his father's love and in his father's household.

The steps to be taken in order to again secure the forfeited citizenship in the "Kingdom" are as follows:

1. "He came to himself."[2]

One must fully realise the life he is leading and the life he might lead as a loyal citizen of the "Kingdom." Having come to realise the difference in the kind and quality of the two kinds of life, one must then have a sincere, intense, and burning desire to adopt the new life.

2. "I will arise and go to my father."[3]

One must be willing to break away from and turn his back on the things which are occupying his present life.

3. "I will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son."[4]

[1] Luke xv., 11–32. [2] *Ibid.*, 17. [3] *Ibid.*, 18.
[4] *Ibid.*, 18, 19.

Feeling keenly his misuse of his life, his lost opportunities, his neglected use of physical, mental, and moral powers, and repenting sincerely and wholeheartedly for the past, he must go to his God and in humbleness of spirit ask for forgiveness.

4. "Make me as one of thy hired servants."[1]

One must be willing to obey the commands, and to work as a servant of God.

5. "And he arose and came to his father."[2]

Not only must there be repentance for the past sinful life, a willingness to break away from all the associations with the old life, and a determination to enter upon a new life, and to assume the duties and obligations attendant on citizenship in the "Kingdom," but there must be an arising up and a putting into action of the wishes and desires of the heart and mind.

6. "But when he was a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him."[3]

A welcome to the full privileges of citizenship in the "Kingdom" awaits those who truly and sincerely take these steps.

Is this a strange, unnatural procedure to be taken in order to recover the lost citizenship in the "Kingdom of God"?

Consider the steps necessary to be taken by a foreigner in order to become a citizen of the United States.

[1] Luke xv., 19. [2] *Ibid.*, 20. [3] *Ibid.*, 20.

(1) He must realise the kind of life he is leading in the land of his birth and the kind of life lived in the United States, and he must have a desire to become a United States citizen.

(2) He must be willing to break away from his old life, its associations, and its companionships.

(3) He must show his preference for citizenship of the United States by asking the government to overlook his former allegiance and to accept his new allegiance.

(4) He must be willing to obey the laws and to live according to the statutes of the United States.

(5) Not only must he be willing and anxious to change his citizenship but he must leave his own country and cross to the United States, and after making a preliminary declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States and waiting a definite time on probation, he must take the following oath:

"I am attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and it is my intention to become a citizen of the United States, and to renounce absolutely and for ever all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty, and particularly to ———— of which at this time I am a subject, and it is my intention to permanently reside in the United States."

(6) Upon his compliance with these acts and

taking the above oath, the United States will accept and welcome him as a citizen.

By combining the teachings of Christ, the nature of the "Kingdom" will be evident.

Love for God and love for man, expressed by obedience to the commands of the Almighty and by service to one's neighbour, are the duties resting upon the citizen of the "Kingdom of God." This twofold love opens the heart to the heavenly influences and establishes a direct channel of communication between the Father in heaven and His child on earth. When one renounces allegiance to all the things of earth and the gods of this world and consecrates his life to the service of God and man, he performs his duty as a citizen of the "Kingdom of God," and the life of that "Kingdom" enters into his heart and he lives as a worthy citizen of the "Kingdom" here on earth. When death comes and the deserted physical temple is laid away in the earth, the soul arises and enters into that abode where the King of Kings and Lord of Lords reigns and where citizenship is continued in another sphere.

To become a citizen of the "Kingdom" in the sphere where God and His angels dwell, it is essential that one should live as a true and faithful citizen of that "Kingdom" while here on earth; for death is but the vehicle which transports the loyal citizens of the "Kingdom" from this earthly abode to the home of the Most High.

Citizenship is a matter of growth. A foreigner, on coming to the United States and becoming a citizen thereof, cannot be expected to love his adopted country with that intense love, or to obey its laws with that supreme devotion, which characterise a man who for many years has endeavoured to live the life of a strong, valuable American citizen. It requires time for love to grow, for patriotism to develop, for a knowledge of the life, customs, and laws of the country to be obtained; so that it is only by painstaking study and wholehearted service to one's country that the highest quality of citizenship can be obtained.

This is likewise true with regard to citizenship in the "Kingdom of God." The newly enrolled citizen is not expected at once to live the perfect life of a citizen of the "Kingdom."

Christ said that the law of the growth of a citizen of the "Kingdom" is a parallel to the law of growth in the vegetable world: "First the blade, then the ear, and after that, the full corn in the ear."[1] Worthy citizenship is the outcome of an evolutionary development, through slow, regular growth, man ever reaching upward for the sunshine and nourishment of heaven, and God ever giving to man what he asks of Him.

The test of citizenship in the "Kingdom" is love—love expressed through service to man.

[1] Mark iv., 28.

This is evidenced by Christ's picture of the Last Judgment:

"And before Him shall be gathered all nations: and He shall separate them from one another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats:

"And He shall set the sheep on His right hand, but the goats on the left.

"Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:

"For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger and ye took me in:

"Naked and ye clothed me: I was sick and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

"Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink?

"When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee?

"Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?

"And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto thee, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

"Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels:

"For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink:

"I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not.

"Then shall they also answer him saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee?

"Then shall He answer them saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous unto life eternal."[1]

Service to God does not consist in separating oneself from one's fellows and living apart from the world, and spending one's time in the study of the Bible and in prayer to God; service to God is expressed only in service to man.

Love which is not expressed in service is not true love, but merely a sickly, sentimental emotionalism. Christ loved Lazarus, and when He learned that Lazarus was dead, He shed tears of pity, left His daily work, journeyed a long distance to the home of the deceased, and used His power to put life into the dead body.[2]

Love to God and love to man should be shown by pitying and helping those in distress, and by using one's powers, abilities, and means to remove those things which hamper, limit, crush, or destroy

[1] Matt, xxv., 32–46. [1] John xi., 1–44.

human life, and to enlarge the "Kingdom of God" by recruiting citizens and by helping them to live the fullest and most perfect life.

Citizenship in the "Kingdom" should be made evident by one's endeavour to spiritualise all the activities of life and to reconstruct society on the basis of love.

"And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the Kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people."[1]

To work for the Christianisation of society, by causing the social sentiments, customs, laws, institutions, and governments to be permeated and overruled by the teachings of Christ, is the duty of the citizen of the "Kingdom."

It is not enough for a Christian to try to convert and Christianise the individual in the hope that eventually the perfect individual will create a perfect society; he must also seek to remove all the hindrances and stumbling-blocks which impede the upward climb of the individual along the political, industrial, and social slopes of life. His aim should be to Christianise business, politics, education, literature, art, and recreation, so that whether men eat or drink or whatever they do, they will do all to the glory of God.

[1] Matt. ix., 35.

Dr. Washington Gladden has clearly stated this truth in these words:

"The end of Christianity is two fold, a perfect man in a perfect society. These purposes are never separated, they cannot be separated. No man can be redeemed and saved alone; no community can be reformed and elevated save as the individuals of which it is composed are regenerated. . . . Christianity would create a perfect society, and to this end it must produce perfect men; it would bring forth perfect men, and to this end it must construct a perfect society."[1]

Though the growth of the "Kingdom" on earth may be slow and almost imperceptible through the quiet growth of universal love, Christ urged His followers not to be discouraged thereby.

"And he said, whereunto shall we liken the Kingdom of God? or with what comparison shall we compare it? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that be in the earth: but when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all herbs, and shooteth out great branches; so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it."[2]

At another time He said: "The Kingdom of Heaven" is like unto leaven, which a woman took,

[1] *Tools and the Man*, pp. 1, 2.
[2] Mark iv., 30–32; Matt. xiii., 31, 32.

and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened."[1]

As the seed grows and the leaven exerts its power silently but persistently by the help and guidance of God, so the "Kingdom" in like manner grows; and as sure as the seed will grow into a wide-spreading tree and the leaven will permeate and change the whole meal, so sure may the citizens of the "Kingdom" be that in the fulness of time His "Kingdom" will come and His will "will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

[1] Matt. xiii., 33.

NON-RESISTANCE

NON-RESISTANCE

THE Angels' song which greeted the shepherds on the hills of Judea, proclaimed the mission of Christ on earth: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men."[1]

The fundamental principle of Christ's life, the basis of His Gospel, was love—wholehearted love for God, and wholehearted love for man.

A prominent charity worker recently remarked:

"I have been thinking over the advice given to Abraham Lincoln by his mother, 'Love everybody, hinder nobody, and the world will be glad some day that you were born,' and have come to the conclusion that she was right in advising her son to 'hinder nobody,' but that to 'love everybody' is an impossibility. We all have enemies, and there are some who say untrue and unkind things about us, and to love those who do us injury is contrary to human nature."

Christ was persecuted and reviled, He was slandered and insulted, He was scourged and crucified, yet, to the end of His earthly pilgrimage, He exemplified in His life a pure and holy love.

His advice to mankind was:

"But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but

[1] Luke ii., 14.

whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

"And if any man shall sue thee at the law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.

"And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain."[1]

In these verses Christ enumerated the following wrongs from which men suffer: physical violence, injury to reputation, legal injustice, and governmental oppression.

The attempt to interpret this teaching of Christ literally has caused much mental confusion and has evoked keen ridicule with the result that this doctrine of non-resistance has been laid away with many other utopian schemes for the regulation of life as unworkable and chimerical.

While the "letter killeth," the "spirit maketh alive"; and on penetrating to the heart of this doctrine there will be revealed this vital truth, that "non-resistance to evil" is only the practical application of Christ's teaching of love to the problems of daily life.

The old Mosaic law of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" is a congenial rule of conduct for most men of the twentieth century. But Christ declared: "Ye have found that it was said: 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth'; but I say unto you, Resist not evil." "Resist

[1] Matt. v., 39–41.

not evil," is the new commandment which repealed the law of Moses, and which became one of the foundation pillars of Christianity.

PHYSICAL VIOLENCE.—A story is told of one of Rev. Dwight L. Moody's converts who had been appointed to keep order during certain revival meetings in Chicago. One evening, a half-tipsy man by continual interruption sought to break up the service. The converted guard at first gently remonstrated with him and for his words of peace was struck a blow on the cheek. Instead of retaliating, the convert, having heard Mr. Moody preach on the subject of non-resistance, at once turned his other cheek toward his assailant. The disturber immediately took advantage of this opportunity to land a blow on the other cheek of the convert. "Then," said the convert, in relating this incident, "as I had lived up to Christ's teaching,—that if we are struck on one cheek, to turn the other also,—I then hauled off and knocked the man down."

If Christ intended this injunction to be taken literally, why, when smitten on the cheek by the high priest, did He not turn His other cheek to be smitten also? To have done so would have been not a display of love, but only the placing before the high priest of a temptation to again do a wrong.

Christ taught the sacredness of human life, and that to preserve life is a duty resting on every individual. To protect and defend life is right and

proper, but to protect and defend life by doing injury to another is specifically condemned by Christ.

If there is a duty imposed on the individual to protect his life, then shall one meekly submit to injury? When on several occasions the people attempted to stone or otherwise to maltreat Christ, He went away and departed from their sight.[1]

Christ was no coward. He had a work to do, and He resolutely went forward in the face of opposition and in spite of his foes to accomplish His mission. "Then said some of them of Jerusalem, Is not this He, whom they seek to kill? But, lo, He speaketh boldly."[2]

In sending His disciples on a missionary journey, He warned them of the hostility they would meet with, and gave them this council: "When they persecute you in this city, flee into the next."[3]

Love for mankind will not permit the doing of injury to a brother even for the protection of our own life. Apprehension of consequences is no excuse for disobedience to the commands of Christ. Christ declared that blessed is the man who loses his life for the Redeemer's sake.

Mr. Ernest Crosby has told the following incident to show how Count Tolstoi interpreted in practice Christ's teaching of non-resistance:

"I spent a couple of days at his (Tolstoi's) country

[1] John viii., 59; x., 39.
[2] John vii., 25, 26.
[3] Matt. x., 23.

house in 1894. There was a very interesting Swiss governess there, and she told me this story: Just two or three days before I arrived there his little daughter, who was then ten years old, had been out playing in front of the house with a village boy from the neighbouring village; they got to quarrelling about something or other; the boy had taken up a stick and given her a hard hit on the arm with it, so that her arm was quite black-and-blue. The little girl ran into the house, crying. Evidently she had not read any of her father's books, because she rushed up to him and said, 'Papa, this naughty boy has hit me on the arm. Do come out and give him a whipping!' The governess hearing what was going on listened to see how Tolstoi would take this very natural demand. He took the little girl on his lap. 'Why,' he said, 'my dear, what good would it do if I went out and whipped that boy? Your arm would hurt you just as much.' 'Yes, yes,'—and she, as a little girl would, went on crying. 'He's a naughty boy and you ought to whip him.' 'Why,' he said, 'my dear, what did that boy hit you for? He hit you because he was angry at you. That means that for a few moments there he hated you. Now, don't you think that we ought to try to make him stop hating? If I go out there and give him a whipping he 'll not only hate you but he 'll hate me too and he may get into such a habit of hating that he may go on hating all the rest of his life. Now don't you think it will be a very much better thing if we can do something which will make him love us instead of hate us? Perhaps it will change that boy's character all the rest of his life.' By that time the little girl's arm did not hurt very much and she

began to be rather amused; she wondered what her father was going to say; she was very fond of her father and wanted to please him. Well, he soothed her a little longer. He said, 'Now I 'll tell you what I 'd do if I were you. That raspberry jam in the pantry there which we had for tea last night, if I were you I 'd go and get a saucer and spoon and some of that jam and take it out to the small boy. I 'm inclined to think he 'll begin to love us then and I think he would never think of such a thing as hitting a little girl again.' Well, the little girl went. She got the jam in a saucer and spoon and she took it out to the little boy. I am very sorry that all the rest I know of that story is that the boy ate the jam. I have never heard what his future history was."

In commenting on this story, Mr. Crosby said:

"It seems to me that Tolstoi's argument there is perfectly sound. It is likely it would be impossible to turn that boy into a good boy; I am not sure; but I believe Tolstoi's way of going at him was the only possible way of really making a good boy out of him. You can imagine that boy, after he got a whipping,—probably he knew he deserved it, but he would have gone down cursing and swearing to himself at the whole Tolstoi family. I believe he would have got more or less of a habit of hating people. Then if you try to imagine his feelings, on the other hand, when the door opened and this little girl came out with the raspberry jam, his resistance of his rising feelings of resentment, then when you think what a rare feeling perhaps it was to a little peasant boy, how

he could not resist the temptation, and in what a shame-faced way he must have come forward and gulped it down, and how he must have gone to his house convinced that those people up there on the hill were a great deal better than he was and if he was ever going to be a good man he must behave a little more in the way that they did, it seems to me that Tolstoi there did right."[1]

If we meet with physical violence, we should act as did Christ, who, while nailed to the cross and suffering from the tortures which had been inflicted on Him, interceded for those who did Him injury by praying, "Father! forgive them; for they know not what they do."[2]

Robert Wright, who was elected governor of Maryland in 1806, fought three duels, though having in each case reluctantly accepted the challenge, for he was of a peaceable disposition; but he was unwilling to decline lest he should be branded as a coward. After the third duel, a gentleman said to him: "You must be a very brave man to confront death three times." "Not so," replied the Governor, "any coward can fight a duel, but it takes a very courageous man to beg another's pardon."

It requires greater strength of character for a man to go through the world with love in the heart than to go about carrying a chip on the shoulder.

[1] Address before The Liberal Club of Buffalo, December 20th, 1900.

[2] Luke xxiii., 34.

Injury to Reputation.—Society dictates and most men practise the doctrine that it is right and proper to use force to avenge an insult or a slander, when it is directed against oneself.

Love will not permit of retaliation. Though Peter thrice denied his Lord, Christ forgave him.[1] When Judas with a kiss betrayed his Master to the chief priests and soldiers, Christ called him "Friend."[2]

At His trial Christ endured insult uncomplainingly and slander without retaliation.[3]

When Saul was on the Damascus road breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, Christ appeared to him, and, instead of smiting him to the earth for his slanderous statements and bitter insults, in language more like that of an injured friend than of an offended God, said, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Saul, his eyes now opened to the enormity of his past acts, at once repented and thereupon consecrated his future life to the service of Christ.[4]

From the time he reached manhood and onward through his earthly career,—at the bar, in the legislative halls, and in the Presidential chair,—Abraham Lincoln by his life beautifully illustrated Christ's teaching of non-resistance.

On being chided for extending favour to one of

[1] Mark xvi., 7; John xxi., 15–19.
[2] Matt. xxvi., 45–50.
[3] Matt. xxvi., 67; xxvii., 30; Mark xiv., 65.
[4] Acts ix., 1–22.

the meanest maligners in his own party, he said: "If he is malignant to me, I can't follow suit."

Major Whitney once told him of a certain lawyer who was trying to find out what Lincoln really thought of him, and said: "I don't like him after his treatment of you in 1854," to which Mr. Lincoln replied: "I can't harbour enmity to any one."

Though Edward M. Stanton, in public speech and in private correspondence, had customarily referred to President Lincoln, as "an imbecile," "a low, cunning clown," and as the "original gorilla," and had charged his administration with "peculation and fraud," and had so discourteously and disdainfully treated him, that Mr. Lincoln had confessed to a friend, "I have never been so brutally treated as by that man Stanton," yet, in spite of all that Stanton had done to injure him, the President gave him the portfolio of Secretary of War in his cabinet.

One evening, a little company of the Salvation Army was holding service on a street corner in the city of Buffalo, when a half-tipsy onlooker began reviling the officer who was preaching, and sought to break up the meeting. Instead of rebuking the disturber, or knocking him down, the officer went up to that human wreck and, placing his hand in a friendly manner on the swaying shoulder, remarked kindly: "Well, brother,

I don't blame you. I used to do as you are doing, but I found it didn't pay."

To defend one's reputation by denying untrue accusations is right, proper, and Christian, but to use force in retaliation is un-Christian.

A blow struck in retaliation for the utterance of a slander will not prove the untruthfulness of it. Let one's character and life refute the slander; it is the only refutation capable of extinguishing it. "What you are," said Emerson, "speaks so loudly, that I cannot hear what you say."

Legal Injustice.—Count Leon Tolstoi, taking literally Christ's teaching of non-resistance, has been led to proclaim:

"The first thing which astounded me, when I had understood the commandment of non-resistance to evil in its simple sense, was that earthly courts of justice not only are not in accordance with it, but are directly contrary to it, contrary also to the spirit of the whole teaching, and that consequently if Christ thought of these tribunals He must have condemned them.

"Christ says, 'Resist not evil': the object of the courts is to resist evil. Christ says, 'Return good for evil': the courts render evil for evil. Christ says, 'Do not classify men as good and bad'; the courts are occupied in making this distinction. Christ said, 'Forgive all men; . . . love your enemies, do good to those that hate you'; the courts do not forgive but punish; they render not good but evil to those whom they call the enemies of society. So that it comes to

this, that Christ must have denied all courts of justice."[1]

Christ never advocated the abolition of courts, any more than He advocated the abolition of government. Courts of law are essential for the existence of a stable form of government; a stable form of government is necessary for the full development of the life of a people; therefore, as Christ came to teach men how to live the most complete life, He impliedly approved of all agencies which assisted in His work.

The despotic government sent its officers to arrest Christ, who had violated no law of the State and had done no wrong to any human being, for as Pilate declared: "I find in him no fault at all." When one of His disciples attempted by force to resist the officers, Christ rebuked him saying: "I could have twelve legions of angels to rescue me," but He did not call for them.

He permitted the illegal trial, the unjust conviction, and the cruel scourging to take place, only protesting that He was innocent. Though He possessed the power to strike down to death with the thunderbolts of heaven those who were illegally trying Him, He used no violence, but submitted to the unrighteous decision of the court.

Christ specifically and unequivocably taught that when personal difficulties cannot be settled

[1] *Christ's Christianity*, pp. 122, 123.

in an amicable manner by the parties in dispute, or by means of arbitrators, that the controversy should be submitted "unto the church," which was the legal tribunal of the Hebrew people.[1]

Christ further taught that even if the individual is called upon to suffer legal injustice, he should not retaliate, but should continue to apply the doctrine of love to those who were the cause of the infliction of the injury.

Governmental Oppression.—Christ taught by His life obedience to all law. He never violated the laws of Rome or resisted the decrees of the government. Though He possessed the power to overthrow the government which persecuted and finally killed Him, He neither used His power nor retaliated for the wrongs done Him.

To reform the government required the reformation of the people. He went to the source of power —the people—and sought to impart to them higher ideals of living and nobler uses of life. Though He died upon the cross, the teachings He had sown grew until the oppression of the Roman government was turned upon itself and the imperial monarchy disintegrated and finally disappeared from earth.

The Christian's duty is not to forcibly resist the government for the wrongs done him by the government, but rather to blazen forth the truth, until a public sentiment shall be formed which will

[1] Matt. xviii., 15–17.

permanently reform the government, and thereby prevent a repetition of the wrong.

SUMMARY.—Christ's law of life, which is the key to His teaching of non-resistance, is found in the following passages:

"But I say unto you, love your enemies, do good to them which hate you.

"Bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you."[1]

"Do good to them which hate you," and you will learn to love your enemies.

The eminent French psychologist, Ribot, in considering this statement, says that it is a well-known law that if we do any one a real kindness or a sincere service, we awaken within ourselves a benevolent feeling toward that person and a special interest in him which we may not have felt before. We cannot, perhaps, force ourselves to love, but we can force ourselves to do a service to an enemy, acting as though we loved him, and that law of nature will create in us the love we did not have.

"Resist not evil" means that evil should not be resisted with evil, physical force with physical force, calumny with calumny, vituperation with vituperation, and that nothing should be done which does not express love. If men attack us, we should defend ourselves, if necessary, but never to the extent of injuring others.

[1] Luke vi., 27, 28.

Milton says: "Who overcomes by force, hath overcome but half his foe," while Schiller tells us that "the enemy who is overturned will rise again, but he who is reconciled is truly vanquished."

No power can destroy itself. Evil will not obliterate evil. Force will not eliminate force. The antidote of evil, anger, and envy, Christ declared to be love. The application of love will remove barriers and will wipe away all that hinders the exchange of love.

It is a universal and unchangeable law, that like begets like, that hate breeds hate, and that love wins love. The only way to conquer an enemy is to make of him a friend, the only way to overcome evil is to overcome it with good.

Christ did not teach that we should turn the other cheek or give away our coat for the sake of suffering. He repeatedly said that he who does not take up his cross and renounce all, and is not prepared for the consequences which follow obedience to His gospel, cannot be His disciple.

In sending forth the twelve disciples, Christ said: "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves."[1]

Count Leon Tolstoi has wisely said:

"Christ meant what indeed he said. It may be affirmed that the constant fulfilment of this rule is

[1] Matt. x., 16.

difficult, and that not every man will find his happiness in obeying it; it may be said that it is foolish, that as unbelievers pretend, Christ was a visionary, an idealist, whose impracticable rules were only followed through the stupidity of His disciples. But it is impossible not to admit that Christ said very clearly and definitely that which he intended to say, namely, that men according to His teaching should not resist evil, and that therefore he who accepted His teaching could not resist it. Nevertheless, neither believers, nor unbelievers, understand these words of Christ in this clear and simple sense."[1]

EXCEPTION.—There is one exception which Christ made to this rule of non-resistance.

"And they come to Jerusalem: and Jesus went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money changers, and the seats of them that sold doves;

"And would not suffer that any man should carry any vessel through the temple.

"And he taught, saying unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer? but ye have made it a den of thieves."[2]

Christ used force to defend others, but never to defend himself. In like manner, it is the duty of the individual to defend all beings whom God hath placed in his keeping.

[1] *Christ's Christianity*, p. 110.

[2] Mark xi., 15–17.

"And, behold, one of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest, and smote off his ear.

"Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.

"Thinkest thou that I cannot pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?"[1]

As Christ could have received redress by appealing to God, an appeal to the sword was wrong. Christ rebuked Peter for resenting the injury done to Him, because it was unnecessary to use force.

To use the sword is wrong, and he who uses force will suffer from the use of force. The duty of the individual is to provide a way of redress other than by force. If he fails to provide such remedy and uses force, he will be compelled to suffer because of his neglect to take measures to secure a peaceful way of obtaining justice.

When there is no other remedy possible but force to protect the rights of another, then force may be used. There was no way by which Christ could have rescued the Temple from the profanation of the traders, but by the use of force, and force He, therefore, used.

By His example, we learn that it is the duty of the individual to protect another from misuse.

[1] Matt. xxvi., 51–53.

But it is well to remember that it is our duty to provide the means whereby such protection may be had without the use of force, and for a failure to provide such means punishment will follow.

CHRIST'S METHOD.—For all wrongs, Christ has provided a remedy; for all controversies, a plan for settlement.

"If thy brother shall trespass against thee," [said Christ,] "go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone.

"If he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.

"If he shall neglect to hear thee, tell it unto the church; and if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican."[1]

The surrender of personal force as a means of self-protection is superceded by the principle of appeal to the sense of justice. Personal controversies of every kind, nature, and description should be settled as follows:

(1) By personal negotiation: The individual receiving the injury should endeavour to make peace by a kindly attitude and by an earnest effort to wipe away all unfriendly and unkind feelings.

(2) By friendly mediation: If peace cannot be made by the parties themselves, the injured

[1] Matt. xviii., 15–17.

party should seek a friendly third party to arbitrate the controversy and endeavour to bring about a reconciliation.

(3) If personal negotiation and friendly arbitration fail, then the injured party should bring the matter in controversy before a legal tribunal, where the subject in dispute may be settled on the basis of law and equity.

(4) If these means fail to secure justice or to effect a reconciliation, the Christian is admonished not to use force, but to let the matter in dispute rest, and to sever all future social connection with the unrepentant wrong-doer.

If the individual desires forgiveness for his transgressions of the Divine law, he must practise towards his neighbour the acts which issue from a deepseated love for him. Only as we forgive others for their acts of violence, slander, injustice, and meanness towards us, have we the right to ask the Almighty for forgiveness for our sinful and unkind acts toward Him,—for as Christ said: "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive you your trespasses."

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

IN the "Kingdom of God" the individual is the unit of value. Christ rated and measured everything by that imperial unit.

In the social world, the family, and not the individual, is deemed the unit. This is so because society is made up of combined families.

In primitive society, the family was the state, and the father of the family was the sole law-maker and law-enforcer. In the process of time, neighbouring families united for the purpose of mutual defence against aggressors or for offensive warfare. Out of this union of families, the tribe was born. The families still remained intact and separate self-governing communities, though they transferred certain powers to an elected chief or council. The next evolutionary step taken was the uniting of small tribes for military purposes, and, as more and more power was delegated by the families, the nation was formed.

The family being the social unit, the purity, permanence, and welfare of society depends upon the purity, permanence, and welfare of the family.

If the family life be polluted, no purification of the other forms of the social order will reach down

to the source of social life. When the family decays, society decays, for, as Herbert Spencer says, "The welfare of the family underlies the welfare of society."

"The solidity and health of the social body depend upon the soundness of the unit," wrote William E. Gladstone. "That unit is the family; and the hinge of the family is to be found in the great and profound institution of marriage." Therefore, on account of the supreme importance of marriage to the well-being of the community, the right conception of its status is of deep and vital import.

"The word 'marriage' signifies, in the first instance, that act by which a man and a woman unite for life, with the intent to discharge towards society and one another those duties which result from the relation of husband and wife. The act of union having once been accomplished, the word comes afterwards to denote the relation itself."[1]

The Nature and Character of Marriage.

"Marriage is either a contract or a status and relation growing out of that contract. As the former, it is defined under the modern doctrine, as a civil contract to which is essential the consent of parties capable of contracting, given according to the forms prescribed by law, if any are required. As the latter, it is the civil status or personal relation of one man and

[1] Schouler's *Domestic Relations*, p. 12.

one woman, united by contract and mutual consent for their joint lives, to discharge toward each other and the community the duties imposed by law on the relation of husband and wife."[1]

Sir William Blackstone said regarding the common law of England: "Our law considers marriage in no other light than a civil contract."[2]

The common law and the statutes of about one-half of the States of the Union define marriage as a purely civil contract. The courts in several of the States, having found difficulty in distinguishing this contract from other civil contracts, have almost generally conceded marriage to be a civil contract only as to the agreement of the parties to marry, and this conception of the definition of marriage has been adopted into the statutes of several States.

Marriage is more than a contract. Independent of and beyond the contract itself, it requires the performance of certain definite acts to be performed by the parties in order to constitute a civil marriage. The rights and obligations of the marriage status are fixed by society, and are regulated and controlled by public authority, upon principles of public policy which are beyond and above the parties themselves.

Mutual consent, as in all contracts, brings the parties together; but mutual consent cannot sepa-

[1] *U. S. Report on Marriage and Divorce*, part 1, 1909, p 182.
[2] *Commentaries*, 1847, vol. i., p. 43.

rate them. Except where the legislature by general or special ordinance enables the courts to step in and pronounce a solemn divorce, it is only by the death of one of the parties that the tie is dissolved.

The status is always regulated by the law of the State. The contract of the parties is simply an agreement to enter into a certain status or relation. Judge Story says: "It appears to me to be something more than a mere contract. It is rather to be deemed an institution of society, founded upon the consent and contract of the parties."[1]

One of the best definitions of the marriage contract and status is found in the following court decision:

"When the contracting parties have entered into the marriage state, they have not so much entered into a contract as into a new relation, the rights, duties, and obligations of which rest not upon their agreement, but upon the general law of the State, statutory or common, which defines and prescribes those rights, duties, and obligations. They are of law, not of contract. It was of contract that the relation should be established, but being established, the power of the parties as to their extent or duration is at an end."[2]

"Marriage," declares Dr. John Fulton, "is not a contract, but a state of life instituted and ordained of God; and the contract of marriage is

[1] *Conflict of Laws*, § 108, note.
[2] Adams *v.* Palmer, 51 Me., 483.

an agreement between competent persons to live together in that estate according to God's holy ordinance."[1]

ORIGIN OF MARRIAGE.—In the Book of Genesis, God is reported to have said:

"Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."[2]

More specifically, the creation of man and woman is described in the following verses:

"And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

"And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.

"And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him.

"And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof.

"And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man.

[1] *Laws of Marriage*, 11. [2] Gen. i., 26, 27.

"And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man."[1]

The Almighty, by the bringing together of man and woman to live, to develop, and to work as one being, and to raise children to carry out the plans of the Maker, created marriage.

According to the Book of Genesis, marriage is the first contract performed on earth. God himself is reported to have solemnly ratified the union in these words: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh."[2]

"We read that God's determination was to make 'an helpmeet for' man, but the expression which He used implies much more; literally it means 'one as his front, his reflected image, his exact counterpart.' It is employed to describe things which are alike and answer to each other: and in this passage it points to the possession of a common nature and attributes, of responsive affections, of a mind and intellect capable of sharing one's thoughts and aspirations."[3]

Men and women were created for the purpose of co-operating with each other, through the performance of different functions. God assigned to the sexes different physical, mental, and moral characteristics. The faculties possessed by each

[1] Gen. ii., 7, 15, 18, 21–23. [2] Gen. ii., 24.
[3] *The History of Marriage*, by H. B. Luckock, p. 4.

are not possessed in the same degree, nor are they manifested in the same mode. Christ declared: "From the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female." Neither sex alone fully images the Maker; it is only when the two are united that both sides of humanity are seen and the full man is presented to view.

Shakespeare, with his keen insight into the human heart and into the life of men and women, said:

> "He is the half part of a blessed man,
> Left to be finished by such as she;
> And she is a fair divided excellence,
> Whose fulness of perfection lies in him."

Hegel expressed the same truth in these words: "I win myself in another person, that I become in her what she on her part secures in me."[2]

Though the functions and uses which distinguish the sexes are fundamentally different, yet they run side by side in two exactly parallel lines, the one corresponding to the other, and the two, brought together in marriage, become reconciled and mutually adapted, and thereby complete the whole circle of social life. This is the only sane and reasonable explanation of the unity and sanctity of marriage.

Dr. Felix Adler has written:

[1] Matt. xix., 4.
[2] Herzog, *Real Enclklopädie*, art. "Ehe," p. 67.

"We are not married on our wedding-day; on that day we do but begin to be married. The true marriage is an endless process, the perpetual interlinking of two souls while life lasts.

"Marriage is an estate in which we seek to help each other to solve the total problem of our lives. The attraction of the sexes, seen in the light of this conception, is glorified and transfigured. Marriage is an estate in which we charge ourselves, not only with the comfort and the happiness of another but with the problem of the total spiritual destiny of another. And because we live in our influence, because our life is strongest and purest where our influence is most penetrating, therefore, in the estate of marriage it is possible for us to attain a depth of spiritual development such as can be achieved in no other human relationship whatsoever."[1]

Marriage is a Divine institution, resting on Divine appointment and governed by Divine laws.

In the story of the creation of man and woman and their union in marriage, we find the following principles definitely stated:

(1) The equality of man and woman. "So God created man in his own image, . . . male and female."

(2) Conjugal chastity. "Naked and not ashamed."

(3) Their absolute unity. "Shall be one flesh." The first man and first woman were more

[1] *Life and Destiny*, pp. 70–72.

than figuratively one, for they were physically knit together. When physically separated, they become one by marriage as do two separate streams which when joined and blended flow together in a single channel.

(4) The exclusiveness of their union. "The Lord God said: . . . I will make him an help-meet for him." Not two helps, one only was all that was requisite. God created only one woman for Adam, and only one man for Eve.

(5) Its indissolubility. "Cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh."

The Hebrew word which is rendered "cleave" means to be glued to, to be soldered, inseparably joined.[1]

Christ's Attitude toward Marriage.—In the days of Christ, the learned Jews held two opinions as to putting away, that is, such putting away as would dissolve marriage. Some of the Rabbis held, that the text of Deuteronomy[2] allowed the husband to put away his wife whenever she found no favour in his eyes; in other words, whenever he desired to do so; others interpreted the passage to mean that the wife could be put away only when the husband had found some uncleanness in her. Uncleanness they interpreted to mean adultery.

"The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him,

[1] *Marriage* by Luckock, p. 8. [2] Deut. xxiv., 1–4.

and saying unto him, 'Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?' And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother and cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder."[1]

Whatever may be one's views regarding the historical authority of the narrative of the creation of man and of the origin, nature, and purpose of marriage, or the inspirational character of these stories, the fact must be recognised that, in the foregoing quotation, Christ distinctly reaffirmed the following principles applying to the marriage state as contained in the first two chapters of the Book of Genesis.

(1) That when a man and a woman are joined in wedlock they are no more twain; a new person is created; they are thenceforth one flesh, that is, one earthly individuality, with one life, one will, one heart.

(2) That but one man and one woman shall constitute a marital union. On another occasion, Christ said: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman put away her hus-

[1] Matt. xix., 3–6.

band, and be married to another, she committeth adultery."[1]

This is a clear statement, showing that for a man to have two wives, or a woman two husbands, at the same time, is for such man or such woman to commit adultery. Polygamy and polyandry are thereby condemned.

(3) That the Mosaic law

"When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife."[2]

was contrary to the law of Jehovah and, therefore, was of no effect.

(4) That the relationship established between the first man and the first woman by the act of creation should be perpetuated in the marriage of their descendants in all after time.

Duty of Marrying.—The essence of Christ's teaching in regard to marriage is that only through the marriage state does a man or woman live the complete life. To fully develop his personality, to awaken all his powers, and to bring to fruition the best within him, a man must experience the responsibilities, perform the duties,

[1] Mark x., 11, 12. [2] Deut. xxiv., 1, 2.

and partake of the benefits arising out of the relationship of a husband and father. In like manner, no woman, who has failed to become a wife and mother, has awakened and developed the richness, the beauty, and the perfection of her personality.

While it is the duty of the individual to marry in order to obtain a fully developed character and to live a well-rounded life, Christ indicated certain exceptions which may be made to this rule.

In answer to the question of the disciples as to whether it is "good to marry," Jesus replied:

"For there are some eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb; and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men; and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake."[1]

By these words Christ taught that one who is unable to perform properly the pro-creative functions of marriage through natural physical defects, or inheritable disease, should not marry; that one who has since birth become physically deformed or diseased, so that evil or no results would follow matrimony, should not marry. For the third exception Christ taught, that if an individual lives a single life in order to better serve God and man, such sacrifice is well-pleasing in His sight.

[1] Matt. xix, 10, 12.

Charles Lamb, who put aside his desire to marry and burned what he called the "little journal of his foolish passion" in order to be "wedded to the fortunes of his sister and poor old father," illustrates Christ's teaching with regard to making a eunuch of oneself "for the kingdom of heaven's sake." He tenderly cared for his aged and dependent father, and watched the moods that foreshadowed the coming of an insane spell over his sweet sister, and when those dark clouds gathered, he would link his arm with hers and lead her to the asylum, there to remain until the mad fit had passed away. Thus, to his father and to his sister, he gave his life with beautiful devotion, and through such self-sacrifice grew strong, sweet, and gentle, and as lovable as becometh a true child of God.

In like manner, an individual, by devoting his life to making the life of another happy, beautiful, pure, and good, may obtain the development of those powers which come through marriage, and receive the blessing of God on the self-sacrifice made.

Safeguarding Marriage.—As marriage is the most important as well as the most sacred contract entered into by human beings, and the most serious and solemn incident of their lives, infinite care should be exercised in its contraction.

The American Episcopal Church, in the introduction to the marriage service, states that

marriage is "honourable among all men, and therefore is not by any to be entered into unadvisedly or lightly; but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God."

As a rule, people give greater forethought to the purchase of a house than to the selection of a partner for life.

When buying real property, the intending purchaser carefully examines the property, makes inquiries as to its value, employs an attorney to ascertain whether or not there are any claims against it or defects in the title, and considers with care his ability to perform his part of the contract.

On the other hand, in selecting a life partner, many act on impulse and in haste, without giving the matter the serious consideration it deserves. They often heedlessly and indiscreetly rush into a contract of matrimony, and repent soon thereafter, when it is too late to restore them to their former position.

Until marriage is looked upon as a sacred, life-long contract, the present social evils of frequent divorce and consecutive marriage will prevail.

The rational, reasonable way to minimise the divorce evil is to place barriers against easy matrimony, and make marriage a bulwark of sincere and holy purpose against which the waves of youthful impetuosity and unripe affection will dash in vain. This the law can do by requiring

the candidates for matrimony to possess proper qualifications, and by providing a period of time within which careful consideration may be given to the duties growing out of the marriage state. Reformatory measures should begin at the altar, and not at the divorce court. A system which permits a young couple still in their "teens" to appear before a justice of the peace or a minister of the Gospel and enter into the most solemn contract of their lives, without the consent of their parents, the knowledge of their friends, or the opportunity for reflection, can but terminate in many fatal mistakes and life-long miseries.

To safeguard marriage the following plans are suggested:

(1) Marriage License.—A marriage license issued by the State should be required to be procured before the ceremony be performed. In all the States, with the exception of New Jersey and South Carolina, licenses to marry are now required, but they prove of little value except as evidence of the performance of an actual marriage, and they thereby constitute but a mere formality. This is so, because a marriage ceremony may follow immediately on the issuance of a license.

A provision should be made for the publication of the license and for a reasonable period of time to elapse between the issuance of the license and the performance of the ceremony, which period should be of sufficient duration to allow

the parties a chance to give serious thought to the importance of the status they are about to enter, of the duties and responsibility arising out of such relation, and of the fitness of each for the other. A three weeks' intermission between the issuance of the marriage license and the performance of the ceremony ought not to be productive of harm, while it might prove of incalculable value.

Hon. Henry B. Brown, former Justice of the United States Supreme Court has said:

"People may marvel at and deplore the frequency of divorces, but so long as marriages are made upon the whim of a moment, divorces will multiply rather than diminish. It is far better to discourage divorces by making them undesired than by facilitating the unions which make them necessary. Unless the marriage license be preceded by a publication of banns, or followed by an interval of some days before the marriage ceremony, it is but a slight obstacle to the hasty unions which are the most frequent causes of divorce."[1]

The Roman Catholic Church has wisely adopted the following law for the publication of the banns of matrimony:

"In order to place a check upon clandestine marriages, to discover any impediments which may exist, to prevent deceptions and surprises, to afford parents

[1] Address before Maryland State Bar Association, *Law Notes*, October, 1909.

and others interested an opportunity to interpose, if needful, and in order to procure the prayers of the faithful that God may give light, grace, and prosperity to the contracting parties, the Council of Trent has decreed *that the promises of marriage be published on three successive Sundays or Holydays, at the principal Mass by the Parish Priest of the parties.*"[1]

No marriage should be permitted to take place without the intervention of a stated period of time between the issuance of the license and the performance of the ceremony, so that proper forethought may be given by those who are about to take upon themselves the responsibilities and obligations arising out of the marriage state. By safeguarding with a three weeks' period of time intervening between the issuance of the license and the performance of the ceremony, marriages for fun, for pique, and for the gratification of foolish fancies will be rare.

This intermission will not prevent the union of those who truly love each other, who honour and revere the sacred marriage relation, and who are planning for a life-long partnership.

(2) Physical Bill of Health.—The possession of physical as well as mental health, by the parties entering into a marriage contract, should be made a legal requirement. This does not mean that mere weakness or loss of health should bar one from matrimony, but that marriage should

[1] Sess. xxiv.

be denied to those who are afflicted with a disease which is infectuous or hereditary. No law should be passed which would prevent a Robert Browning from stooping and picking "up a fair-coined soul that lay rusting in a pool of tears."[1]

If physical health is a prerequisite to enlistment in the army and the navy and for becoming a policeman or a fireman, ought it not also be a qualification required of those entering the marriage state?

From a social standpoint, individuals have no right, and should not be allowed, to bring into the world children foredoomed to disease and suffering, and thus unfitted for a successful struggle with the conditions of life.

It has been truly said that every child has a right to be well born. There can be no greater crime committed against an individual than to inoculate him with contagion, the effects of which may outlast several generations. Hon. C. H. Reeve has said:

"If the vilest mortal that lives sees proper to marry, the law issues a license for the asking, takes the fee, makes the record, and leaves the offspring and society to shift for themselves the best they can. Even paupers while in the poorhouse, and criminals while in jail, are in every way encouraged and given licenses to marry and are protected by the law. No thought is taken for the unfortunate offspring, or for

[1] *Shelley*, by Francis Thompson, p. 38.

the body politic or the social welfare, and the irreparable evils that must fall upon all. The Church adds its sanction, and its ministers aid in making these civil contracts by performing a ceremony with prayers and benedictions. If it is wise to prohibit polygamy, marriage between relations, and between persons whose insanity or idiocy is self-evident, it is equally wise to prohibit it in all cases where evil may follow. If the law has the power to prohibit and punish violation in the one case, it has equal right in all others.

"There is an endless procession of children from all these sources coming into the mass of population to live lives of crime, immorality, want, suffering, misfortune, and degeneracy, transmitting the taint in constantly widening streams, generation after generation, with ultimate certainty of the deterioration of the race and final ineradicable degeneracy."

The prevalence of certain communicable and inheritable diseases, with their devastating effects upon the lives of parents, as well as upon their offspring, is but little comprehended, despite the publicity work of physicians and the campaign of the American Society of Sanitary and Moral Prophylaxis for the spreading of information on this subject.

Tuberculosis, our national scourge, is a disease so well known as to require but its mere mention in order to bring to our minds a realisation of its ravaging effects on parents and their children.

The so-called social diseases, "The Great Black

Plague," working in darkness, hidden from publicity through the shame of its source, unfettered by sanitary control, and inflicting, unseen, the social body, is but little known and less understood.

These social diseases, being infectuous or inheritable, are sapping the life of the American people, producing untold suffering, and filling hospitals and asylums with multitudes of victims.

The great evils of these diseases are caused through their introduction into married life. A large portion of men contract one or more of these diseases before reaching the marriageable age, and enter into the marriage state wholly ignorant of the fact that they are bearers of contagion to their wives and offspring.

The great prevalence of these diseases is shown by the careful investigations of Dr. Prince A. Morrow, who asserts that "it would be a conservative estimate to state that 60 per cent. of the adult male population of this country are infected."[1]

The devastating effect of those diseases is indicated by the following statistics taken from *Introduction in the Physiology and Hygiene of Sex*, a monograph published by the Society of Sanitary and Moral Prophylaxis:

Eighty per cent. of the men of New York City who contract marriage have had one of the social

[1] *Am. Journal of Sociology*, xiii., 22.

diseases; and 90 per cent. of those men enter into the marriage state uncured.

These diseases are the direct cause of:

Eighty per cent. of all purulent ophthalmia in the new-born.

Thirty-three per cent. of all blindness of the children in the New York School for the Blind.

Fifteen to twenty per cent. of all blindness in the country.

Eighty per cent. of all inflammatory diseases peculiar to women.

Fifty per cent. of all operations performed on the maternal organs.

Forty-five per cent. of all sterile marriages.

Sixty to eighty per cent. of all children dying before birth.

Sixty to eighty per cent. of all children dying shortly after birth.

Sixty-eight per cent. of the mortality of all children.

Many of the affections of the eyes, ears, teeth, bones, and other tissues, suffered by the children of infected parents, which children are often subject to various degenerative changes which are susceptible of being transmitted to the second and third generation.

As these social diseases are curable, a physical bill of health should be required as a prerequisite to the granting of a marriage license, in order that the innocent may not be made to suffer for

the sins of the guilty, and that a healthy race may be produced. The States of Indiana and Washington[1] have enacted laws prohibiting the marriage of those afflicted with tuberculosis and the social diseases, and requiring a physical bill of health to be procured before a marriage can be solemnised.

DIVORCE.—The following utterance was called forth by an attempt on the part of a company of Pharisees to test Christ's position on the legal aspect of divorce:

"The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?

"And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female,

"And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?

"Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.

"They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and put her away?

"He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.

"And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his

[1] Chap. 174, Laws 1909.

wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."[1]

In the Sermon on the Mount, Christ said:

"It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement:

"But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery."[2]

Christ taught by these statements:

(1) That the only ground for divorce is adultery.

(2) That a divorce for any other cause is void, and in the sight of God the parties continue to remain husband and wife.

(3) That a second marriage of the parties who have been divorced on a ground other than adultery, is no marriage in the sight of God, and that such parties live in adultery.

(4) That a person who marries a party who has been divorced on a ground other than adultery, is guilty of adultery.

(5) That the innocent party, who has obtained a divorce on the ground of adultery, is not forbidden to marry again.

(6) Impliedly, He condemned the marriage of the guilty party.

[1] Matt. xix., 3–9.

[2] Matt. v., 31, 32.

Matthew reports Christ to have taught that the marriage bond may be dissolved on one condition—"for the cause of fornication."

Mark and Luke give no hint of any exception having been made, but represent Christ as teaching in the most explicit manner that marriage is absolutely indissoluble.

There is no way of knowing, so far as the accuracy of the testimony is concerned, as to which of these reports is correct.

Some of the leaders in American thought and life interpret the teachings of Christ after this fashion: "The words of Christ, like many of His sayings, can be applied literally only to the social conditions in which He lived, and they are not meant to be a code of law for all later generations," said Dr. Carroll D. Wright. Then having in this manner nullified the teachings of Christ as to their applicability to the conditions of to-day, Dr. Wright continues:

"That several causes (for divorce besides the scriptural one) may be allowed, and should be allowed, lies in the nature of the problem."[1]

Rev. Minot J. Savage, after considering the accounts of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, says:

"It seems to me that we must rationally come to this conclusion,—that there is no divine authority touching this matter, which is binding on the world,

[1] *Practical Sociology*, p. 171.

except as we find that authority in human experience. . . . That we are perfectly free to look at and discuss this question in the light of reason and human experience, and try to decide as to what is best for the individuals concerned and for human society."[1]

Dr. Savage then states his own views:

"If the husband and wife have both ceased to love each other, and there are no children . . . then they should be permitted to separate. . . .

"Suppose there are children; suppose that the husband and wife have both lost their love each for the other, what then? If the children's welfare should be subserved by their maintaining a home, then they are under the highest kind of obligation to maintain that home. . . . But there are cases where the conditions of the home have become so intolerable that it is better for the children to be out of it, to be out from under that kind of influence. In a case like that I believe that separation should take place, and the children put in the guardianship of the one who can best care for them."[2]

According to Dr. Wright and Dr. Savage, who voice the views of the modern prophets in the religious world, when Christ's teachings come into conflict with our individual opinion and a discrepancy exists in the various reports of His doctrine, then we may sweep them aside by assigning their application to conditions which existed at the time Christ spoke, or by stating that

[1] *Men and Women*, pp. 129, 131. [2] *Ibid.*, 139, 140, 141.

the uncertainty as to their exact meaning causes them to be binding on no one.

The so-called higher critics of the Bible are almost a unit in their announced position, that when differences exist in the reports of a rule or statement, then such rule or statement should be rejected and have no place in our thought and life.

This position, if taken, enables one to place his own views above the teachings of Christ, and to substitute individual opinion for the doctrines laid down by the Master.

The teachings in our colleges, the writings of our most eminent sociologists, and the lives of our people clearly indicate that the present trend of thought and life in America in this twentieth century is away from the teachings of Christ on the subject of marriage and divorce, and is toward that ancient pagan doctrine, that individual happiness is the sole test for the entrance into, and the exit from, the marriage state.

"The promotion of happiness is the only safe criterion to guide the lawmaker in either widening or narrowing the door of escape from bad marriages," says Prof. George Elliot Howard, of the University of Nebraska.[1]

Prof. Charles Zueblin, formerly of the University of Chicago, asserts:

"'There can be and are holier alliances without the

[1] *Am. Journal of Sociology*, May, 1909, p. 773.

marriage bond than within it'; while Prof. Franklin H. Giddings of Columbia University says that 'it is not right to set up a technical legal relationship, an economic convenience, or a circumstance of social conventionality as morally superior to the spontaneous preference of a man and woman who know, and whose friends know, that they love each other.'

"The whole or a part of this doctrine has been held and taught by some of the best men and women that have yet lived. Dante foretold it in his *Vita Nuova*. Petrarch proclaimed it in his fidelity to Laura. John Milton, the sanest, as he was the greatest, of Puritans, iterated and re-iterated it in his famous tract on divorce, which no ecclesiastic with a self-respecting regard for his own intellectual reputation has ever dared try to answer. Shelley and Goethe preached it in both their words and deeds. Richard Wagner stood for it unflinchingly throughout life, and gave it expression in the imperishable music of *Tristan and Isolde*. John Stuart Mill, a calm-minded philosopher, held fast to it through his relations with Mrs. Taylor, when his cherished friends cut him dead because of it. George Eliot proclaimed her loyalty to it by a life of very quiet but effective defiance of Mrs. Grundy and all her British matrons. And Herbert Spencer carefully formulated it in his autobiography."[1]

Harold Bolce, in summing up the sociological teachings of our colleges, says:

[1] Quoted from *Blasting at the Rock of Ages*, by Harold Bolce, *Cosmopolitan*, May, 1909, pp. 672, 673.

"The consensus of college teaching is that marriage is a purely civil contract which should be terminable at the will of either party, and that the church should have no more to do with it than with the conveyance of real estate; that religion should be no more permitted to intervene against divorce than to say a man should not have the legal right to withdraw money deposited in a bank; and that when humanity realises the true meaning of marriage, the home will cease to be the domain of tyranny and fear. Therefore they teach to American young men and women that marriage is not decreed by God and that no commandments against divorce are divine."[1]

Mrs. Humphry Ward, in her recent novel, *Marriage à la Mode*, says:

"When shall we see some real comity of nations in these matters of international marriage and divorce. How ridiculous and intolerable some of the situations become. No woman in the better future that is coming should be forced either by law or opinion to continue the relations of marriage with a man she has come to despise. Marriage is merely proclaimed love, and if love fails, marriage has no further meaning or *raison d'être;* it comes, or should come, automatically to an end. This is the first article in the woman's character, and without it marriage has neither value nor sanctity."

If the happiness of the individual is the sole object of marriage, then when happiness ceases

[1] *Cosmopolitan*, August, 1909, p. 314.

to exist, the marriage relation should be dissolved. Marriage, under such theory, would be simply a living together for a longer or shorter period, according to the wishes of the parties.

In the time of Christ, this view of marriage generally prevailed, and the result was, that even the philosophers and statesmen discarded their wives with impunity. Cicero repudiated his wife Terentia that he might obtain a coveted dowry with another; and he discarded the latter because she did not lament the death of his daughter by the former. Cato was divorced from his wife Attilia after she had borne him two children, and he transferred his second wife to his friend Hortensius, after whose death he again married her. Augustus compelled the husband of Livia to abandon her that she might become his wife.

The women emulated the men in their career of divorces. Martial speaks of a woman who had married her tenth husband. Juvenal refers to one who had had eight husbands in five years. St. Jerome declared that there dwelt in Rome a wife who had married her twenty-third husband, she being his twenty-first wife. "There is not a woman left," said Seneca, "who is ashamed of being divorced, now that the most distinguished ladies count their years not by the consuls, but by their husbands."[1]

[1] *Our Christian Heritage*, by James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 357.

Cessation of love does not dissolve the marriage relation between husband and wife, any more than the cessation of love dissolves the relation of parent and child.

If, as Milton viewed it, marriage is simply a partnership, to be formed at the pleasure and dissolved at the will of the parties, then the suggestion of Mr. Francis Thompson may soon come true:

"Whereas from our present via media—facilitation of divorce—can only result the era when the young lady in reduced circumstances will no longer turn governess, but will be open to engagement as wife at a reasonable stipend."[1]

Horace Greeley wisely said:

"I am perfectly willing to see all social experiments tried that any earnest, rational being deems calculated to promote the well-being of the human family; but I insist that this matter of marriage and divorce has passed beyond the reasonable scope of experiment. The ground has all been travelled over and over: from Indissoluble Monogamic Marriage down through Polygamy, Concubinage, easy Divorce, to absolute free love. Mankind have tried every possible modification and shade of relation between man and woman. If these multiform, protracted, diversified, infinitely repeated experiments have not established the superiority of the union of one man to one woman for life—in short, marriage—to all other forms

[1] *Shelley*, p. 72.

of sexual relation, then history is a deluding mist, and man has hitherto lived in vain."[1]

Nothing can be more certain than the fact that Christ distinctly reaffirmed the Jehovian view of marriage, as reported in the Book of Genesis, and that He taught that in the sight of God, marriage could not be dissolved except possibly on one ground, "fornication." Nowhere in Christ's teachings is there to be found even a hint which could be construed to sanction divorce on any ground other than that of "fornication."

It is the Christian's duty to accept Christ's teaching as to the sacredness of marriage and its indissolubility, except, possibly, on the ground of the adultery of one of the parties, and to do his utmost to stem the growing tide of easy divorce which, unless checked, will lead to universal free love.

"Casting one's eye back over the last two thousand years, there seems to have been, first, a plague of divorce in later pagan Roman days; secondly, a stamping out of it by Christianity; and now, thirdly, a vehement outbreak occurring. To our shame and cost, it is most virulent and widespread in the United States, where, despite some measures already taken to check the evil, it seems still on the increase."[2]

In the U. S. Census Bulletin No. 96 on *Marriage*

[1] *Recollections*, p. 580.

[2] James Cardinal Gibbons, "Divorce"—*Century*, May, 1909, p. 145.

and Divorce, the following startling figures are found:

During the twenty years, from 1887–1906, an average of one marriage in twelve terminated in divorce. Eliminating the Catholics, who are forbidden by their Church to be divorced, out of every ten marriages of non-Catholics, one ends in divorce.

"If the number of divorces in proportion to the population had been the same in 1905 as it was in 1870, the number of absolute divorces reported in 1905 would have been only 24,000, whereas, it was, in fact, 67,791. In 1906, the actual number was 72,062, while the ratio of 1870 would have resulted in only 24,398."

From 1860 to 1870, there were 1½ divorces to 1000 of our population.

From 1870 to 1880, there were 2 divorces to 1000 of our population.

From 1880 to 1890, there were 3 divorces to 1000 of our population.

From 1890 to 1900, there were 4 divorces to 1000 of our population.

In 1905 there were three times as many divorces in proportion to the population as there were in 1870.

The rate of divorce in the United States is twice that of Switzerland, thrice that of France, five times that of the German Empire, and is

larger than the combined divorce rate of Austria, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, Netherlands, England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, German Empire, Italy, and the Kingdom of Hungary.

It has been calculated that, if the movement toward divorce retains its present velocity, in forty years one marriage in four will end by divorce, and in eighty years one marriage in two will terminate in the divorce courts.

There are twenty-eight different grounds for divorce provided by the laws of the various States, besides an undesignated number left to the discretion of the Courts of the State of Washington.

If the entrance into the marriage state is safeguarded by the requirement of a license issued at least twenty-one days before the marriage ceremony, and by a bill of health showing that the parties are free from infectious and inheritable diseases, and the door to its dissolution is closed, to be opened only on the ground of adultery, would not many of the present-day social evils begin to pass away?

Hume, the historian and philosopher, has written:

"We need not be afraid of drawing the marriage knot the closest possible. The amity between the persons, where it is solid and sincere, will rather gain by it, and where it is wavering and uncertain, it will be the best expedient for fixing it. How many

frivolous quarrels and disgusts are there, which people of common prudence endeavour to forget, when they lie under the necessity of passing their lives together, but which would soon be inflamed into the most deadly hatred, were they pursued to the uttermost, under the prospect of an easy separation."[1]

Gibbons, the historian, has said:

"A specious theory is confuted by this free and perfect experiment [at Rome], which demonstrated that the liberty of divorce does not contribute to happiness and virtue. The facility of separation would destroy all mutual confidence, and inflame every trifling dispute."[2]

In the old English case of Evans *vs.* Evans,[3] Sir William Scott, afterward Lord Stowell, said:

"It must be carefully remembered that the general happiness of the married life is secured by its indissolubility. When people understand that they must live together, except for a very few reasons known to the law, they learn to soften, by mutual accommodation, that yoke which they know they cannot shake off. They become good husbands and good wives, for necessity is a powerful matter in teaching the duties it imposes. If it were once understood, that upon mutual disgust married persons might become legally separated, many couples who now pass through the world with mutual comfort, with attention to

[1] *Philos. Works*, vol. iii., p. 208, Am. Ed.
[2] *History of Rome*, vol. v., chap. 44, p. 55, Bohn's Ed.
[3] Cited by *Coleridge on Blackstone*, p. 1440.

their offspring, and to the moral order of civil society, might have been at this moment living in a state of mutual unkindness, in a state of most licentious and unreserved immorality. In this case as in many others, the happiness of some individuals must be sacrificed to the greater and more general good."

SEPARATION.—Christ forbids the dissolution of the marriage contract except possibly on one ground. He does not directly touch on the question of the legal or voluntary separation of the parties. His teachings contain no prohibition against voluntary separation in case of conjugal infelicity, and no demand on the innocent to sacrifice health, life, or children for the sake of maintaining the family life intact. Indirectly, He urged that when association and environment tend to narrow, limit, or corrupt human life and its full and complete development, it then becomes the duty of the individual to get away from all those unholy associations and debasing influences. Cruel and inhuman treatment, chronic intemperance, or deliberate desertion are some of the grounds decreed by our laws as justifying legal separation, and no teaching of Christ comes into conflict with them.

REMEDIES FOR THE DIVORCE EVIL.—(1) In addition to the adoption of a law requiring a twenty-one-day license and a physical bill of health as prerequisites to the entrance into the marriage state, an effort should be made to

embody into the law of each State Christ's teaching with regard to divorce, viz: that the adultery of one of the parties is the only ground for the dissolution of the marriage contract.

(2) Education for the young, in order that they may appreciate the sacredness of the marriage relation; the necessity for preparation for this, the most momentous step in life; the duties arising out of this status, together with a clear conception of the social responsibilities resting on the family. The three agencies which should undertake the education of the young with respect to marriage are, the parents in the home, the teachers in the schools, and the clergymen in the churches.

(A) Home Training.—"The preparation which young women are given in all too many homes is but a training calculated to lead in the shortest time possible from the marriage altar to the divorce court" [writes Rabbi Krauskopf, D.D., of Philadelphia, Pa.].

"With too many parents there seems to be little consciousness that, besides a body to hang clothes upon, and besides certain social accomplishments with which to charm, the marriageable daughter has also a mind, a heart, a soul, a pair of hands, that require training in the science and art of keeping the husband contented and happy within the home of her sovereignty, and keeping herself contented and happy with the prize she has won. There is no preparation for the needs and responsibilities of domestic life, of home companionship, of economic housekeeping.

There is no knowledge of the art of settling down contentedly and happily with the man to whom she is linked for life, no skill in harmonising differences of taste and temperament, which unharmonised often prove disastrous to early married life. There is no love implanted for the sacred joys of motherhood. There is no knowledge of the meaning of the word 'helpmate.' There is no conception of the difficulties involved in earning money, seeing how lavishly it is being expended upon her, seeing with what readiness her every demand for it is supplied.

"There is probably no thought which occupies a young society woman more than the thought of being married; there is probably no thought which occupies her less than that of how to be happy when married, or how to make her husband happy."[1]

The present teaching in many American homes is, that the securing of wealth and social position are the main objects of marriage. The material advantages which may be secured through marriage are deeply impressed on the minds of the young. As a result of such teaching, marriage has come to be considered as merely a commercial contract, and that, like other commercial contracts, it may be dissolved by mutual consent, or with the assistance of the courts.

Christ's teaching that the contract of marriage was ordained by the Almighty to unify the lives of two beings of opposite sex in order that each may develop all their inherent capacities and

[1] *Am. Journal of Sociology*, May, 1909, p. 783.

powers and thereby enjoy the fullest and most complete life, should be the basis of the instruction given. The child should be taught that the chief earthly mission of both man and woman is to fulfil the duties arising out of the marriage state; that a clean and pure life is necessary in order that the grim visage of disease may not hover over the household, destroying health and bringing evil to all, and that no "sins of the father . . . be visited upon the children"; and that, as marriage is for life, each party to the marriage should strive with all the powers of being to bring love, peace, and concord into the home. They should be taught to look upon marriage as a coveted privilege, and not as a convenience, a speculation, or a diversion.

(B) Schools.—In the public schools, physiology should be taught with the object of impressing upon the minds of the children the importance of health as being the chief factor of a life of happiness, and as a duty to the one who is chosen as a life partner, and also for the sake of the children which may issue from such marriage.

In the colleges, the sociological courses should banish the pernicious teaching so prevalent to-day, that the object of marriage is the happiness of the individual or for the propagation of the race, and should enthrone Christ's teaching as to the divine nature of the marriage contract, indissoluble except on the ground of adultery.

(C) Churches.—From the pulpit and in the Sunday-school, the pastor should teach the Christian view of marriage until every man, woman, and child connected with the church has obtained a clear knowledge of Christ's teaching. Further, the clergyman should be outspoken in his condemnation of easy divorce and the unchristian marriage of parties divorced on grounds other than that of adultery, and should refuse to re-marry the guilty party in a divorce action or the innocent party who has obtained a divorce on any ground other than the adultery of the former consort.

(3) Since 184,568 divorces, or nearly twenty per cent. of the entire number reported in the United States from 1887–1906, were granted because of the intemperance of one of the parties, the necessity of the spread of the doctrines of temperance is plainly apparent.

No fair and complete trial of Christ's teachings with regard to marriage and divorce has been given. The doing of good to others as the chief motive in life has been tried only by a few saints scattered through the ages, so that only in rare instances has married life been lived on the high plane advocated by the Master.

CRIME AND THE CRIMINAL

"Then shall the King say unto them . . . Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:

"For . . . I was in prison and ye came unto me.

"Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee . . . in prison, and came unto thee?

"And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."[1]

By these words, Christ identified Himself with every prisoner. He proclaimed to the world the fact that in every human being there exist divine possibilities, no matter how low one may have sunk in degradation. No crime committed by an individual could be so heinous, no life so evil as to blot out the divine goodness implanted in the human soul. Though the prodigal son had wandered far from his father's house and had wasted his life and spent his substance in riotous living, he was still the son of his father and had ever awaiting him a joyous welcome on his return home.

Christ taught that in each individual there

[1] Matt. xxv: 34–40.

exist good and evil, and that the sinner or the criminal (sin and crime being violations of law—sin the violation of the law of God, and crime the violation of the law of the state) is but the natural product of the continual development of the evil, while the good remained dormant.

To the woman who was taken in adultery and brought to Him for judgment, Christ, after looking over her past life and weighing the effect of the evil environment, bad education, and dire temptations, as against the pure influences, good companionship, and high ideals which had been vouchsafed to her, said: "Neither do I condemn thee." Coming into her life when her feelings were stirred to their very depths by the public accusation and denouncement, and finding that the better angels of her nature were beginning to emerge from within the chambers of her soul where they had been confined by the demons of evil heretofore ruling her life, Christ tenderly and lovingly gave her this parting council: "Go and sin no more."

Christ's teachings clearly indicate that He believed that if the life of the individual was evil, it was because the good had not been evolved; and that if the good were awakened and a high ideal implanted, the good would gradually overcome the evil, and thereby transform the life.

As the evening shadows gathered about the three crosses which upheld the dying forms of the

Saviour and the two criminals, the jeering voices of the rabble were swelled by the voice of one of the expiring thieves reviling the Man of Sorrows hanging beside him. Instantly the other criminal, whose heart had been touched by Him who was called "King of the Jews," rebuked his comrade, saying: "Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deed; but this man hath done nothing amiss."

Having come under the enthralling charm of Christ, this man realised that there was a better way of living than the one he had known, and there was born within him a desire to turn away from his old sinful life and to enter upon a new and higher one; and the dying penitent said unto Jesus, "Lord, remember me when thou comest unto thy kingdom."

Christ, knowing that the convicted criminal had had aroused within him the good which had lain dormant for so many years and that a new ideal of life was blazing in his mind, pronounced the words which gave the man a new hope: "Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise."[1]

From that moment, countless men and women living in sin and crime and to whom there has come a vision of Christ, awakening the good and pointing out a better way of living, have

[1] Luke xxii: 39–43.

had their aspirations ennobled, their characters changed, and their lives transformed.

Christ drew a sharp distinction between the sin and the sinner. He ever with mighty power condemned the sin, and His teachings are as a powerful magnifying glass through which the corroding effects and the blighting influence of sin upon character and life are made visible to all. But the individual sinner was always treated as an erring child who needed light and help, and who might be loved into repentance and won from his evil ways by the example and companionship of a devoted friend.

Few individuals have lived without having committed some crime. Our prisons contain only the criminals who have been caught, tried, and convicted, and, according to the teachings of Christ, they are, in the sight of the Almighty, no more guilty than are those outside of prison walls who have committed a crime and have escaped detection.

Mrs. Maud Ballington Booth has written:

"Prison communities come from no uncivilised island where they form a different species of the human family, nor are they drawn from one section of the population confined to the slums. They are from the great, wide world at large. Some have had homes of ease and comfort, and have been educated in our finest colleges and schools. Society gives its quota, so does the great world of the common people,

while yet others come from homes of poverty and some from no homes at all. There are the educated and the ignorant, the rich and the poor, the industrious and the idle, the brilliant and the poorly endowed. . . . Another gross misconception is the belief that all men in prison are dishonest. People forget how many and devious are the causes for which men can be imprisoned. Sometimes [says Mrs. Booth] when I have asked a business man to employ one of our 'boys' the answer has been: 'I am in sympathy with your work and pity these poor fellows, but in my business I dare not do it as there would be opportunities to steal and it would not be right to those whose interests I must protect.' This has shown to me how constantly the thought of theft and robbery is associated with all who come from prison. There are many within the walls who have never misappropriated a cent. This does not mean they are guiltless, for their crime may have very justly brought them to conviction, but there is no reason to imagine that because of that punishment they must be ranked as dishonest." [1]

Well might it be for the person who thinks of condemning instead of helping the unfortunates who are confined within prison walls or who have been discharged after serving their sentence to remember the words of Gen. R. Brinkerhoff:

"They [prisoners] are creatures of circumstance. They are like all the rest of us. Has there never been a time in your history, in your hot youth, when,

[1] *After Prison—What?* pp. 16, 17.

if the law had been enforced against you, you might have been landed in this or some other jail? If there is such a man, who has passed middle life, I should like to see him. We are all miserable creatures, except by the grace of God. As John Newton said, when he saw a man on his way to be hung, 'There goes John Newton, except for the grace of God.'"[1]

Then let him remember Christ's rebuke to the men who were urging the punishment of the woman taken in adultery: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her."[2]

The attitude an individual should take toward a criminal who has wronged him is summed up in the following words of Christ:

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven."[3]

If the individual may not hate the man who robs him, neither may society hate the man who robs society. There is only one Christian law of human conduct; therefore, the attitude of society should be the same as is the attitude of the individual, for society is but an aggregation of individuals.

[1] *National Prison Ass'n Report*, 1889, p. 45.
[2] John viii., 7. [3] Matt. v., 43–45.

The authority to measure justice in providing punishment for the criminal is not only not conferred on the individual, but is emphatically denied to him; "judge not," is the command of Christ.

To assume the seat of judgment is to assume a function which belongs only to the all-seeing and all-knowing Jehovah. No human being has sufficient knowledge or capacity to exercise this function.

How can a judge know enough of the prisoner to enable him to pronounce a just sentence? How can he know the inherited traits of the prisoner, his early training, his environment, his education, his temptations, and the mixed motives of good and evil which prompted him to commit the crime?

Count Leon Tolstoi has written:

"In every act we find a certain amount of liberty and a certain amount of necessity.

"The greater the amount of liberty, the less the amount of necessity, and conversely. . . .

"A drowning man who clutches another and drags him down to death, a starving mother who steals food that her child may have nourishment, a soldier in the ranks, trained to respect discipline, who kills an unarmed man at the order of a superior,—are all less guilty—that is, less free and more subject to the law of necessity, the more clearly we understand the conditions under which they acted; they are more guilty—that is, more free, the more firmly we believe that the man who dragged the other down was not

drowning, that the mother was not starving, and that the soldier was not in the ranks. . . .

"The act of an insane person, of a drunkard, of a fanatic, seems to be less free and more obedient to necessity to one who knows the conditions, and more free, less obedient to necessity, to one ignorant of the facts.

"In every case, the idea of liberty increases or diminishes according to the point of view from which the act is examined."[1]

The sentences pronounced by the various judges of our courts on the conviction of prisoners for the commission of the same crime under practically the same circumstances, with a view to apportioning the penalties in accordance with the demerit of the convicted offenders, vary so greatly, that a record of the sentences pronounced plainly indicates the impossibility of rendering a correct and just judgment. From the viewpoint of fairness and justice, the sentences pronounced by our judges are a standing disgrace in this day of our boasted civilisation. Practical experience teaches the wisdom of the command of Christ, that we "judge not" one another.

The attitude of the individual toward the criminal should be of a threefold character:

(1) He should recognise the fact that there exist good and evil within the criminal, that the man became a criminal because the evil had been

[1] *Power and Liberty*, pp. 96-98.

developed and the good had remained dormant, and that the criminal is his brother.

(2) He should condemn the crime which had been committed.

(3) He should try to bring the criminal to a realisation of the kind of life he is living and to awaken the better angels of his nature by implanting within him a new and higher aim in life.

The attitude of the state toward the criminal should be the same as the attitude of the individual. It should put aside, as unjust and unfair, the unchristian theory that the object of punishment is to inflict upon the prisoner a suffering equal in severity to the injury resulting from the crime committed in order to satisfy the sense of social retributive justice; and, by legislation and practice, should condemn the dictum of Sir James Stephen, who wrote:

"I think it highly desirable that criminals should be hated; that the punishment inflicted upon them should be so contrived as to give expression of the hatred, and to satisfy it, so far as the public provision of means for expressing and gratifying a natural healthy sentiment can justify and encourage it."[1]

The state should likewise abandon that outworn and unworkable theory that it can find protection for itself only by inflicting punishments of great severity, and should realise that experience has

[1] *History of Criminal Laws*, vol. ii., chap. 17, p. 82.

fully demonstrated the truth of the old maxim: "Crime thrives upon severe penalties."

Beccaria, in reviewing the effects of this principle, has written:

"The countries and times most notorious for severity of punishment were always those in which the most bloody and inhuman actions and the most atrocious crimes were committed. In proportion as punishment became more cruel, the minds of men grew hardened and insensible."[1]

It should recognise the law formulated by science: "That society must secure protection from crime and the social diseases of criminality by treatment of individual criminals,"[2] and not by the mere infliction of punishment.

Finally, it should recognise the fact that underneath every prison garb is the marred image of Deity, and should seek at all times, to reform and transform the life of the prisoner, so that from an anti-social being he may become a well-rounded, strong, valuable citizen.

The effect of the present methods of protecting the social welfare is summed up by Col. Vincent M. Masten, Military Instructor of the New York State Reformatory, Elmira, N. Y., in these words: "Not one studious penologist in the land can be induced to place the stamp of approval upon the

[1] *Essays on Crime and Punishment*, p. 94.

[2] *The Science of Penology*, by Henry M. Boies, p. 40.

manner in which we sentence, classify, detain, and institutionally educate and train law-breakers."[1]

The justness of this criticism is demonstrated by the constant re-arrest and re-conviction of criminals and the large proportion of recidivists always temporarily in confinement, which are estimated by Dr. Drahms to be over fifty per cent. of all convicts,[2] while it is estimated by Henry M. Boies that "ninety per cent. of the convicts discharged from prison return to criminal lives."[3]

Dr. Drahms has drawn up the following indictment against the present method of treating prisoners:

"The prison from every point of view is the chief ostensible promoter of every ill it essays to cure. . . . It succeeds in turning out more direct results in the shape of confirmed criminals, hardened to the contemplation of theoretic vice in all its forms and degrees, ready to put their knowledge into practice, than any other accredited agency within the range of experience or devised by the folly of man."[4]

The following plans for the reformation of criminals are suggested as being directly in line with the teachings of Christ.

JUVENILE COURT.—Hon. Ben. B. Lindsey says:

[1] Introduction to *The Crime Problem.*
[2] *The Criminal*, pp. 240 *et seq.*
[3] *The Science of Penology*, p. 126.
[4] *The Criminal*, p. 193.

"In my judgment there are 100,000 children, dependent and delinquent, coming to the courts of this country every year, and within the period of sixteen years that means 1,600,000 children coming to the courts of this nation in every generation of childhood."[1]

The fact that such a large number of children are brought annually before the courts of our country, warrants the establishment of special courts in which only juvenile offenders are tried. The old-time practice of forcing juvenile offenders into contact with hardened professional criminals should be stopped, for the minds of the young are apt to be corrupted by intercourse with the old offenders.

The juvenile court should rest upon the following principles:

First.—That a child is the most valuable asset in the world. Christ declared: "It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish."[2]

Second.—That it is not the duty of the state to administer to a child a punishment proportioned to the supposed magnitude of the offence committed; but rather to seek to discover the causes which induced the child to commit the wrongful act, and to endeavour to remove such influences from his life and to direct his footsteps into

[1] *National Child Labour Committee, Pamphlet No. 101*, p. 15.
[2] Matt. xviii., 14.

paths which will lead to upright living and worthy citizenship.

The procedure of the juvenile courts should be directly opposite to that in vogue at the present time in the police courts throughout the country. The attitude of the judge should be that of an admonishing father whose main purpose should be to awaken in the mind of the juvenile a sense of the wrong committed, to enlighten him as to the attitude of society toward a criminal, and to indicate a better way of living.

Instead of sending the culprit to prison, the judge should put the child on good behaviour and place him under the care of a voluntary or paid parole officer to whom the child should be directed to report at stated times for a definite period. Such officer should act as the confidential friend and adviser of the offender as well as the agent of the law. If, after the expiration of the time fixed for probation, signs of reformation have been discovered and the parole officer recommends the offender's discharge, he should be discharged from custody and all record of his arrest and probation should be blotted out.

The imprisonment of juvenile offenders works a positive injury, rather than proves a reformative agency, in that it breaks down the self-respect of the prisoner, and inflicts a life-long stigma on his character, and therefore should not be permitted.

"Go and sin no more" should be the advice of the judge, as it was the advice of Christ to the unfortunate woman.

PROBATION FOR ADULTS.—"It is a commonplace of morals, that, in the path of evil, it is the first step that counts the most." In taking the first lawless step, the unfortunate may have only responded to bad external influences, which arose from immoral environment or evil companionship. In a moment of weakness, the man may have committed some minor offence against the law, such as drunkenness, corner-lounging, etc. The arresting of the offender and bringing him before a judge to have his offence rehearsed often arouses such a feeling of shame and mortification and awakens such a keen realisation of what the course of life entered upon really leads to, that it proves a sufficient punishment and does more good than could be obtained by any subsequent incarceration.

A man who has been arrested for the first time and brought before a court for trial, is usually in a condition and state of mind to be deeply influenced. He has been stopped in the beginning of crime and is compelled to give serious thought to his course of life as he stands disgraced before the community. This is the time for bringing him to future right living by giving him a chance to redeem himself.

To sentence to prison such offenders against

the minor provisions of the criminal law and to submit them to the daily humiliation of the life in a cell, to the undermining companionship of fellow-creatures hardened in crime, and to the degradation of ever after being branded with the prison stigma, is to place such persons in the path which leads to a criminal career. M. Lalone, Inspector-General of Prisons in France, stated before a commission: "that with our existing system, twenty-four hours' imprisonment suffices under certain circumstances to ruin a man. I do not exaggerate. I say what I have seen. The prisoner meets a corrupt recidivist, they appoint a rendezvous outside, and that man is lost."[1] The truth of this statement is borne out by the testimony of American penologists.

On the other hand, to take such persons at the moment sentence is pronounced and to place them in the custody of probation officers who would guide them away from those influences which caused their downfall and direct their attention to the importance of their reformation as a prerequisite to their future freedom, would, in most cases, have the tendency to start the offender on a new life which would ultimately lead to worthy citizenship.

The system of adult probation is not an experiment. Eight States now make use of it, viz., California, Connecticut (for offences not

[1] Quoted from *Science of Penology*, by Henry M. Boies, p. 251.

punishable in the State prison), Maine (as to Cumberland County, including the city of Portland), Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, and Vermont.

The report of the Senate Committee for the District of Columbia, April 25, 1908, gives the following statistics:

"Massachusetts has operated a probation system for adults since 1878. In New York this method of dealing with criminals was tried by various courts until in 1900 the Court of Special Sessions in the city of New York, first division [the old city of New York], organised it on the basis generally adopted by the Legislature in 1906; in Maryland, the Commission on Indeterminate Sentence, appointed under the law of 1906, recently reported in favour of extending probation to adults throughout the State. . . .

"In the States named many thousands of prisoners have been freed according to this process. In no case which has come to the knowledge of the committee have more than 16 per cent. of those set free failed to fulfil the conditions of good conduct laid down by the probation or parole commission. In most cases the percentage has been much lower, that for the city of New York being less than 6 per cent. Of the number thus reported not all have been guilty of new offences, re-arrest or re-commitment being ordered in many cases because the subject gives no indication of progress.

"A report on the operation of the plan in New York City has been submitted to the justices of the

Court of Special Sessions, first division, under date of March 6, 1908, by Justices Willard H. Olmstead and Joseph M. Deuel. After noting that 84 per cent. of all juvenile prisoners have been supervised by probation officers since 1902 and that in 5,545 cases out of a total of 6,579 the system has worked with apparently complete success, the report says:

"'During the past seven years 4,896 cases (adult) were investigated by the probation officers of this Court and 2,231 offenders placed on parole. Less than 6 per cent. of this number violated their parole. The percentage of salvage in the case of women probationers was even greater. Two hundred and eighty-eight convicted women had their cases investigated. Of these, 140 were placed on probation, with unsatisfactory results in but six cases. Thus have 2,050 persons convicted of crime, instead of being sent to penal institutions, been reclaimed to useful pursuits and purposes, and instead of being a burden on the taxpayers have become useful members of the community, producers, a help to society instead of a burden and a future menace. What this may mean in mere dollars it would be hard to estimate—the figures would be enormous.'"[1]

When considering the advisability of placing first offenders on probation, our judges should remember the words of Hon. Carlton T. Lewis: "We are dealing not with acts, but with actors; not with deeds, but with men; not with abstractions, but with human hearts, minds, and lives."

[1] Bill to Establish a Probation Commission, in Senate Report No. 569.

PRISONS.—That prisons are essential for the reformation of the criminal is a fact plainly indicated in Christ's picture of the last judgment. As one of the tests of Christianity, Christ gave that of visiting the convicts in prison. He never advocated the abolishment of prisons, but stated that to the end of time, His followers would visit prisons and seek to reclaim those who were therein confined.

The prison should be a place, not where the prisoner's life is cramped and narrowed, not where he is cowed and subdued, not where his health is impaired or destroyed, but rather where he may be developed—physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually,—and where his wrong education may be corrected, his capabilities unfolded, his ideals ennobled, and his character re-created. It should be designed, not as a place of punishment, as is the case to-day, but rather as a hospital, workshop, and intellectual and religious training-school where the reformation of the convict may be effected.

(A) BUILDING. The prison buildings of the State of New York are a specimen of those existing throughout the United States, with some few notable exceptions. The average prison cell is about seven feet long, three and one-half feet wide, and seven feet high, ventilation being supplied through a narrow latticed door, leading into a corridor containing windows which when open admit fresh air.

Mr. C. V. Collins, Superintendent of New York State prisons, in a communication to the Finance Committee of the Senate on April 17, 1909, said: "There are at present 1853 convicts in Sing Sing, crowded into 1200 cells. The cells average only three feet six inches by six feet six inches in floor area, and in some of the cells three men are confined."

The effect on the health and spirits of the prisoners by their confinement in such small, poorly ventilated cells is most depressing. In the hot, muggy, summer days the prisoner finds life almost unbearable. Supt. C. V. Collins, in his Annual Report, issued in January, 1909, said:

"The religious services in the prison chapels are over at ten o'clock on Sunday morning, and the prisoners are then locked in their cells to remain until the next morning. This has always been the custom. The baneful effect on the prisoners of such prolonged detention in the small cells is very apparent on Monday. Some of the men are irritable, some are sullen, and others are despondent.

"Prison officers agree that Monday is for them the most trying day of the week. A custom that produces these results lessens the effect of the reformatory measures by which it is sought to correct the prisoner, and causes a weekly reaction in the progress of the rehabilitating influence of the prison system."

Such prison cells have the undeniable effect of hardening the prisoner's heart and of making him

a determined enemy of the society which sent him to live in such quarters.

Cleanliness and sunlight are coming to be recognised as pronounced reformative agencies. Unless the moroseness, the sullenness, the dark vengefulness which envelop many of the prisoners are impregnated with pure air and bright sunlight very little will be accomplished in the work of awakening the good within and in implanting new ideals of life.

(B) EXAMINATION.—A careful physical, mental, and moral examination should be made of every prisoner upon his entrance into the prison, as well as an investigation into his past history and the causes which led him to commit the crime which brought him into the prison. To endeavour to regenerate human derelicts by applying a stock remedy to all cases is as likely to be productive of good results as would be the giving of the same remedy to all patients in a hospital without reference to their special diseases. Christ at Jacob's well, before giving advice to the sinful woman, examined into her past life, her weaknesses, her temptations, and her powers of resistance, until the woman upon leaving Him in wonderment exclaimed to her companion: "Come, see a man, which told me all things that ever I did."[1] Without a full and complete knowledge of the causes which led to the com-

[1] John iv., 6–30.

mission of the criminal act, no adequate remedies can be applied.

(C) Solitary Confinement.—The Pennsylvania system of solitary confinement, though it frees the prisoner from the presence of evil companions, does not release him from his brooding thoughts or prevent him from indulging in secret vice, for an idle brain inevitably becomes the devil's workshop. It tends to enfeeble his body and mind and causes him to form habits of idleness which, on his release from prison, unfit him for doing the work and overcoming the temptations of the world.

A prisoner in a Pennsylvania prison on being asked, "Why don't you have higher and better thoughts," replied, "Where will I get them?"

(D) Mingling of Prisoners.—All prisoners should be graded in the same manner as is prescribed in the prisons of the State of New York, viz: there should be three grades or classes—Class A, first offenders; Class B, old offenders; Class C, incorrigibles.

The members of one class should not be permitted to come in contact with the members of any other class. Each class should be dealt with as if there were only one class within the prison walls.

The common practice of confining first offenders with hardened, abandoned professional criminals needs but to be mentioned in order to be

condemned. If a young man, who for the first time has committed a crime, is placed in close communion with old offenders whose influence is degrading, whose language is surcharged with oaths, vile suggestions, and infamous themes, and whose example in evading prison discipline and shirking or eluding prison work is demoralising, he must possess an extraordinary character if he comes out of prison unpolluted and unscathed. If a young girl, who has committed a theft or in anger struck a blow, is held for a few weeks or a few months with obscene and depraved women who have lost all sense of shame, of decency, and of womanhood, it cannot be expected that she will come out from her term of imprisonment with her mind unspotted and her ideals untarnished by the environment in which she has been forced to live.

A separate cell should be provided for each prisoner so that when his work is over he may have an opportunity to reflect on his past life, his present condition, and the lessons of the day.

The workshop should be shared in common in order that the prisoner may learn to work with others as he will be obliged to do when he returns to the outside world. No communication between the prisoners should be permitted in the workshop, which should be a place for work only.

Meals should be served at a common table, where general conversation should be permitted,

in order that the prisoner may come in contact with social life for a few hours each day to remind him that he is still a social being.

(E) Mental Education.—A school department should be included in every prison, for in many cases a lack of education or defective education was the cause of the downfall of the prisoner. Dr. Wey of Elmira has said: "It is a mistake to suppose that a criminal is naturally bright. If bright, it is usually in a narrow line, and self-repeating. Like the cunning of the fox, his smartness generally displays itself in furthering his schemes of personal gratification and comfort."[1]

Pope Clement XI wisely declared: "It is of little use to restrain criminals by punishment, unless you reform them by education."

An ignorant man is a social danger, and the feebler his intellect and the stronger his passions, the more dangerous he becomes. The inability to value the best things in life and to distinguish between that which makes for the upbuilding and that which tends to the degrading of character is what, in many cases, brings recruits to the criminal class. Education of the mind is the primary remedy to be applied in order to remove such causes for the making of anti-social beings.

"Unquestionably education such as is obtained in

[1] H. Ellis, *The Criminal*, p. 134.

our public schools does not do everything toward making a man a good citizen, but it does much [said ex-President Theodore Roosevelt]. The lowest and most brutal criminals, those for instance who commit the crime of rape, are in the great majority men who have had either no education or very little."[1]

Little is being done to-day in our prisons in the way of education. The need is great, the time is ripe, and as the majority of prisoners are ignorant, the duty of Christians is to see that no talent is buried because of a lack of knowledge as to how to use it. Dr. Hirsch has wisely declared: "Education is the foundation upon which the whole man is built."[2]

Who [asked Thomas Carlyle] would suppose that education were a thing that had to be advocated on the ground of local expediency, or, indeed, on any ground? as if it stood not on the basis of everlasting duty, as a prime necessity of man. It is a thing which needs no advocating. To impart the gift of thinking to those who cannot think, and yet who could in that case think—this, one would imagine, was the first function a government had to set about discharging."

(F) Industrial Education.—Industrial education is of vital importance to the criminal, as, in many cases, he is without a trade or a

[1] Message to Congress, Dec. 5, 1906.
[2] *Genius and Degeneration*, p. 50.

knowledge of how to labour successfully in order to earn a livelihood.

Proper manual training instils in a man a respect for honest, intelligent labour. A man who can see nothing in manual labour but the exercise of mere brute force, despises both the labour and the labourer. To him all handwork is drudgery. With the acquisition of skill in himself comes a pride in its possession, a pride which often dominates his life. When once he appreciates skill in handicraft or in any manual art, he regards its possession with sympathy and respect, and life takes on a new meaning for him.

A wayward girl of thirteen was arrested and sent to a State institution for the reformation of young girls, where manual training was one of the main features of the institution. For two years, this girl remained a rebellious spirit and was uninfluenced by the educational and reformatory work of the institution. On being placed in the laundry department, she developed unusual skill, and after a few months began to take pride in her work. As her skill increased, her mind began to unfold and to take in the instruction given at the institution. At eighteen, when she received her discharge, she had become a model inmate, and her chief thought and ambition was to do beautiful laundry work and to excel the other workers in the laundry. For the past few years, this former girl of the streets has lived out

in the world leading the hardworking life of a laundress, being temperate and moral and devoted to her work. Through manual training her mind was awakened, her ambitions changed, her character strengthened, and her life transformed.

"'Charlie,' asked Chaplain Phillips of a young man who had just been discharged from prison after serving his third term, 'what are you going to do?' He held up his pale, white hands, and answered: 'Chaplain, these hands never worked; do you think they can learn to work? My father was a thief, and I have stolen one fortune at least, since I was twelve years of age.'"[1]

When the State teaches the criminal a good trade and inspires in him a disposition to practise it, it has transformed a dangerous dependent into an independent citizen.

The State-use system, or the manufacture of supplies for all public institutions, ought not to infringe upon the rights of the labour union, or to do any injury to the workingman who struggles honestly in the world to earn sufficient to support himself and his family. Gen. R. Brinkerhoff has written:

"Prison labour has no appreciable effect on free labour, either in the price of products or wages. How can it have, when the product of convict labour in the United States as compared with free labour in the

[1] *Proceedings of National Prison Ass'n*, 1887, p. 67.

same industries is less than 2 per cent., and the total product of convict labour as compared with the total product of free labour is only fifty-four one-hundredths of 1 per cent.?"[1]

Twenty-four States have adopted the State-use system, thus following the example set by Nevada, which on February 28, 1887, enacted a law providing for its application in a limited way. The United States Government, by acts passed in 1894–95, provided that convicts in the United States penitentiary at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, shall be employed exclusively in the manufacture and production of articles and supplies for the penitentiary and for the government.

The prison industrial department should be conducted, not for the making of money, but for the making of men.

(G) Religious Instruction.

"The great problem of life is education [declares Professor Gates, of the Chicago Theological Seminary]. The mind of the race is growing all the while, and it is for the educator to see that these mental powers are developed in the right direction. But no man's education is complete if religious instruction be omitted. One may know all mysteries of science and literature; he may sweep the heavens with the telescope, or peer into the secrets of nature with the

[1] *Proceedings of National Prison Ass'n*, 1905, p. 14.

microscope; but if in all this he sees not God, he is but poorly educated after all."[1]

If men and women were without passions, without inherited tendencies to vice, and were living in a pure atmosphere away from temptations to do wrong, they might be taught to be good, because to be good is right and proper and insures human happiness. But as men and women are constituted with evil tendencies and inclinations, and are living in a world where temptations to depart from pure and honest living are hourly besetting them, it is idle to expect that they will do right unless they believe in a God who rewards for the keeping, and punishes for the violation, of moral laws.

Mere knowledge of what is right and what is wrong will never cause the doing of the right and the forsaking of the wrong. Judas Iscariot knew the evil of treason, but he betrayed his Master. Some of the world's most noted criminals have talked glibly of the principles of morality and of the ethics of right doing. Morality to be effectual must be governed by the will, and back of the will must lie a motive sufficiently powerful to force the will to definite action.

Former President Eliot of Harvard has said: "No educational system can be successfully carried on without education in morals, and no

[1] *Biblical World*, September, 1902.

education in morals is possible without a religious life."[1]

"Mere culture of the intellect [said Herbert Spencer] (and education as usually conducted amounts to little more) is hardly at all operative upon conduct. . . . Intellect is not a power but an instrument—not a thing which itself moves and works, but a thing which is moved and worked by forces behind it. To say that men are ruled by reason is as irrational as to say that men are ruled by their eyes. Reason is an eye—the eye through which the desires see their way to gratification. And educating it only makes it a better eye—gives it a vision more accurate and more comprehensive—does not at all alter the desires subserved by it. However far-seeing you make it, the passions will still determine the directions in which it shall be turned—the objects on which it shall dwell. Just those ends which the instincts and sentiments propose, will the intellect be employed to accomplish; culture of it having done nothing but increase the ability to accomplish them. . . . Did much knowledge and piercing intelligence suffice to make men good, then Bacon should have been honest, and Napoleon should have been just."[2]

Henry M. Boies has written:

"An uncontrolled selfish desire for personal gratification regardless of others, malice, and ungoverned

[1] *Outlook*, January, 1898.
[2] *Social Statics*, pp. 173, 174.

passion are the general motives for all crimes; . . . moral depravity is the sum and substance of criminality—the reason why men commit crime. It is a positive deduction of Penology—that the cause of crime is the moral depravity of the criminal."[1]

The only religious instructions given in our prisons to-day are the Sunday services and the occasional visits of the prison chaplain or volunteer Christian workers.

Each religious denomination should delegate a clergyman as official chaplain or as visiting chaplain, to undertake the work of daily systematic religious instruction in connection with the educational and manual training, in order that religion may "be so woven into the warp and woof of thought and conduct and character, into one's very life, that it becomes a second nature and the guiding principle of all one's actions."[2]

Indeterminate Sentences.—All sentences should be indeterminate as to time, and continuous until such a time as the convict has been pronounced cured. Definite sentences should be abolished for two reasons:

First.—Fallible man being unable to determine a sentence which in each case would be just, Christ declared that men should "judge not."

[1] *The Science of Penology*, p. 37.

[2] *Essays Miscellaneous*, by Brother Asarias, pp. 70, 71.

Second.—If crime is a disease like unto smallpox or diphtheria, as some claim, then the criminal should receive the same treatment that science has decided is best for one suffering from smallpox or diphtheria: *i.e.*, he should be confined in an institution where his disease can be treated and where he will be detained until cured.

If crime is a mental disease like insanity, as others assert, then the criminal should be treated as alienists prescribe for the insane: he should be confined in an institution where he will receive the best medical care and where he should remain until he is discharged as mentally sound.

If crime is not a disease, as many hold, but is the outcome of the development of the inherent evil which dwells within every human being, resulting from weak will, wrong education, untoward physical environment, or adverse social conditions, then should not the criminal be confined in an institution where his weak will may be strengthened, his wrong education corrected, and where the evil influence of the physical environment and the social conditions can no longer play upon his life and drag him down into the ways of crime?

From whatever viewpoint crime may be considered, only one logical conclusion can be reached, viz: that a place of detention is absolutely indispensable if criminals are to be reformed and remade; and to accomplish such an end, no time

limit should be set, but the treatment should continue until the authorities are convinced that the former anti-social being has had cultivated within him a new and high ideal of life, and has become qualified, by intellectual training, industrial education, and by strength of character, to live the life of a valuable citizen of the state. To establish a time limit for his confinement would be "as irrational as the employment of a doctor for a serious ailment on a time contract."[1]

Under a determinate sentence, the average prisoner is antagonistic to all efforts made to awaken or transform him. Under an indeterminate sentence, the prisoner, with the knowledge that he will be released only when it becomes apparent to the officers who have him in charge that society need no longer fear him, will yield naturally to the work of reformation.

Dr. G. Frank Lydston has written:

"One of the great advantages of the indeterminate sentence is the moral effect upon the criminal of the knowledge that he must either permanently reform or be immured for the rest of his natural life. He soon comes to realise that society will no longer tolerate him at the price of a certain amount of time spent in jail from time to time, but demands that he either prove his worthiness to be at large, or remain permanently in prison."[2]

[1] Boies, *The Science of Penology*, p. 141.
[2] *The Diseases of Society*, p. 606.

Maconochie strikingly says: "When a man keeps the key to his own prison, he is soon persuaded to fit it to the lock."

PAROLE BOARD.—A State Prison Board of Parole, consisting of three members, should be appointed by the governor to pass on all applications for release from prison. The board should have the following powers:

(a) When convinced that the prisoner has been reformed and is determined to live the life of a worthy citizen of the state, and has employment awaiting him which will enable him to earn an honest living, to release him on parole.

To release a prisoner who has no position awaiting him by means of which he may support himself and those dependent upon him for livelihood is to place the man amid temptations which are likely to lead him again into crime. Having no employment, the paroled prisoner eventually drifts to the large city and to that part of the city where food and lodging may be obtained at the lowest price,—and where pinching want is found, the abodes of crime and vice exist. Hunger is apt to induce thievery, and if the paroled prisoner has no way of honestly earning his daily bread, it would be far better to keep him confined within prison walls.

(b) At the end of one year or longer, in the discretion of the board, the paroled prisoner who has not violated his parole or committed any act in

violation of the criminal law, should be discharged from prison.

There is no one thing which a man values more than his personal liberty. To be deprived of liberty and compelled to obey the orders of a keeper, is revolting to every human being. Enforced servitude is repugnant to a man's nature. Therefore, without prisons or places of legal detention, there would be no fear to induce the keeping of the parole. Fear is a potent factor in the life of every human being. If there exist prisons as places of enforced confinement for the violation of one's parole, the parole is apt to be kept.

The result of the workings of the prison parole laws of the State of New York from 1901 to 1907, both years included, is set forth in the following table taken from the Report of the Board of Parole for State Prisons for year ending September 30, 1907:

Original applications considered		2,279
Reapplications considered,		1,513
		3,792
Number of prisoners paroled,		1,378
Number of paroled prisoners discharged,	934	
Number of delinquents returned to prison,	107	
Number of delinquents at large,	116	
Number of prisoners on parole on good standing,	221	
		1,378

"Percentage of delinquents on whole number of prisoners paroled, 16.

"The results shown in the above table are deemed highly satisfactory, and especially so when it is considered that they were attained while the parole system was in a sense in its experimental stage, and very largely with prisoners sentenced for crimes the maximum penalty for which is five years or less, and who, in the main, are a low class of criminals, ignorant, and often mentally and physically deficient."[1]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.—Capital punishment, the cutting short of the life of the criminal, instead of attempting to develop him into a penitent child of God, is directly contrary to the teachings of Christ, for as Wilberforce declared: "To shorten a human life is to put in jeopardy a human soul."

"He steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, and sent messengers before his face, and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. And they did not receive him. . . . And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did? But he turned and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."[2]

EX-CONVICT.—In the eyes of the law, a crimi-

[1] *Annual Report*, p. 10. [2] Luke ix., 51–56.

nal who has served his full sentence and received his discharge is a free man, and no one has a right to regard him other than as a free man.

"Ex-convict" is a name no one has a right to apply to any human being. A convict, after paying his debt to the state in full, becomes a free man. To call a free man an "ex-convict" is to assail his rights as a freeman.

When a sinner repents, Christ said his sins should be blotted out and his past buried, and the remembrance of the sin erased from the pages of memory. "Go and sin no more," implies the giving of help, and not the placing of hindrances in the way of wrong-doers.

Without encouragement and help from the more fortunate, the ex-convict will be unable to make a new start, no matter how high may be his purpose or firm his resolution.

The discharged convict who comes out of prison unrepentant and unreformed, returns to the world to occupy the same place he had occupied before his imprisonment. His companions are ready to welcome him with a planned criminal undertaking in which he is given a part and a helping hand until he has obtained sufficient for his support.

As for the discharged convict who leaves the prison with the determination to live an honest Christian life, what does he find? Does he find Christian men and women ready to extend a

cordial welcome, a bracing friendship, and a helping hand? Does he find Christian people who so rejoice over his repentance and his new resolution that they will assist him to overcome his old temptations and to keep away from his former companions, and give him a new start in life? Or does he find Christian people closing their doors upon him, refusing him aid, denying him work, and saying unto him, "We are done with you," thus leaving him

> "Alone on a wide, wide sea,
> So lonely that even God himself
> Scarce seemeth there to be?"

"But this I affirm [says Bishop Henry Codman Potter]: that Christian society stands, as a body, with a front of brass turned inexorably toward the criminal classes. God forgives, but they will not. The woman who was a sinner He once welcomed, but they spurn her. The man who had fallen He beckoned back into His own loving fellowship, but they repel him. In one word, the criminal and the criminal classes stand to-day, as a rule, in the large, to the Christian Brahman as a Pariah, not to be touched, not to be owned, not to be defiled, if one can help it, by even so much or so little as his passing shadow. The jail-bird, this is the fowl turned verily out of the Christian ark, and for whom the deluge never subsides."[1]

Mrs. Maud Ballington Booth tells the story of

[1] *The Scholar and the State*, p. 169.

a young man brought up in the streets who had been sentenced to prison for burglary. During his imprisonment he had learned from the chaplain a new way of life, and when the time came for his discharge, he went forth with a firm resolve to do right.

"After a few days of effort in the big city he found that it was not so easy to obtain employment as he had anticipated. For several weeks he sought for an honest start in life, but no hand was stretched out to help him. . . . At last flesh and blood could stand the strain no longer. His mind was benumbed and a fever was raging in his blood. Crossing the Boston Common on a bleak rainy afternoon, he stumbled and lost consciousness. Hours passed, when a man chanced to stumble over the prostrate figure. He stooped to see what lay in his path and, finding it was an unconscious man, he turned his face to the light only to discover that it was the face of a friend. Lifting the man from the ground, he tenderly guided the staggering footsteps to his own home.

"True, his home consisted of rooms above a saloon; true, this Samaritan was himself the leader of a gang of burglars, and yet the deed was one of charity, and his was the one hand stretched out to help this sick and helpless man. For weeks he was carefully nursed and tended. The doctor was called to watch over him. When the fever left him and strength returned, nourishing food was provided, and when he was well enough to dress he was welcomed in the room where the gang met and not in any sense made to feel that he had been a burden. All this time no

effort had been made to draw him back into the old way of living. One night as he sat at a little distance, he heard his friends plan a burglary. They had a map stretched out upon the table before them and had marked upon it the several positions to be occupied by different members of the gang, some to enter, while others watched and guarded the house. One point was unguarded, and while they were seeking to re-adjust their company to fill this place, the young man rose and, coming to the table, he laid his finger on the spot and said, 'Put me down there.' The leader of the gang, who had proved so truly his friend, laid his hand upon his shoulder, and said quickly: 'Don't you do it! You have been trying to be honest, stick to it! You have had a long term in prison and are sick of it. Don't go back to the old life!' But the boy turning on him (and there was much truth in his answer) said: 'When I was sick and hungry, who cared? When I was trying to be honest, who helped me? When I lay dying on the Common, who was it stretched out a helping hand, who paid my doctor's bill, and who nursed me? You did and with you I shall cast my lot.' He would not be dissuaded. That night he not only went out and aided in the burglary but was caught by the police. In his trial the fact came out that he had only been a few months out of prison. The fact that he had been so soon detected in crime with his old gang was evidence of his criminal propensities and he was returned to prison for an extra long term as an old offender."

The Associated Press sent out the following report on February 13, 1909:

"The San Francisco bribery graft case had a dramatic climax late to-day when Francis J. Heney, assistant district attorney, who had been in charge of the prosecution for two years, was shot and seriously wounded in Judge Lawlor's court-room by Morris Haas, a former convict. The shooting occurred during a brief recess in the third trial of Abraham Ruef on a charge of bribery, now in its eleventh week.

"Haas kept a small liquor store on Polk Street. He claims his persecution in San Bernardino was framed up. He appealed to Heney not to make his record public, as his wife and children knew nothing of it. The exposure in court ruined his business, and he failed last July.

"Directly after the shooting, while Mr. Heney was still lying on the floor, several newspaper reporters approached the would-be assassin, who had not been identified, and asked him for his name. At first he refused to give it, then he said:

"'I am Morris Haas. Heney ruined me. I don't care what becomes of me now.'

"'I shot him,' he shouted, 'to get even for humiliating me!'

"The incident which led Haas to shoot Heney occurred in Judge Dooling's court-room on April 24th last. Ten jurors had been secured to try Ruef in the Parkside bribery case. Heney arose and in a dramatic manner declared that he had evidence that one of the jury was unfit to serve. Taking from his pocket a police identification card, representing a man in convict's stripes, with a number on his breast, Heney walked over to the railing behind

which the jurors sat, and, showing the photograph to Haas, asked him if he knew the man. Unnerved by the suddenness of the disclosure, Haas stammered an acknowledgment that the photograph was of himself, and then requested him that he be spared the disgrace of publicity. Heney, however, was relentless.

"'You have been convicted of a felony, have you not,' he said, 'and have served a term at San Quentin?'

"The juror admitted that he had, but protested that he had been pardoned and restored to citizenship. That was in 1888, and he had been convicted at San Bernardino of embezzlement. The man on whose accusation he had been sent to prison, Charles Lessinger, had subsequently committed suicide by jumping out of a window of the Waldeck Sanitarium.

"'I asked to be relieved from serving on the jury when I was first called,' added Haas, 'but was refused. I did not want to tell of an experience which would bring disgrace on me after all these years.'

"The episode brought Frank Murphy, of Ruef's counsel, to his feet with a protest. He thought it scandalous that public odium should be thrust on Haas when, if the district attorney had told the defence privately of his discovery, the juror would have been quietly excused.

"'I have no doubt of that,' said Heney, 'but I have doubt if you knew of an ex-felon being in the jury-box and we did not know that you would say anything about it.'"[1]

[1] *Buffalo Express*, November 14, 1908.

To make men trustworthy, trust them. Distrust begets reason for distrust. Christ trusted the doubting Thomas, and Thomas rose up to possess a sublime faith. Christ would not suffer even the denial of Peter to shake His trust in him, and Peter became eminently worthy of this trust.

When Lord Nelson raised to the mast-head of his flag-ship the signal to his fleet, "England expects every man to do his duty," every English sailor felt that as England trusted him and expected him to do his duty, he would not disappoint the hope centred in him. Each man had enlisted to serve a country which expected from him great things, and each man responded nobly. The Admiral who placed his trust in his men inspired in them such a determination to become worthy of the trust imposed, that neither the double line of hostile ships nor the blood-drenched decks of their own vessels could shatter it.

Mr. J. A. Leonard, Superintendent of the State Reformatory, Mansfield, Ohio, in an address before the American Prison Association, on the effect of placing trust in prisoners, said with regard to the men working on the prison farm without attendant guards:

"The number trusted is growing larger and larger each year. We select them very carefully. I take a boy out quietly in the evening and have a talk with

him. I ask him if he will voluntarily assume that responsibility. If he agrees, I produce a bond, one that has been prepared with some red ink, red ribbon, and red seals, and burdened with all the meaningless expressions that our legal brethren have burdened us with. At the bottom of it there are two clauses of plain English that the boy is supposed to understand. There is nothing like being impressive as he signs the bond. I say to him: 'Now, here is the place for your surety. Where are you going to get it?' He replies, 'I believe my folks will give it.' 'That cannot be done, my boy. This is an honour bond.' Then, 'I will do it,' I tell him. 'I will be your first friend and stand for you with the deputy.'

"I have signed ten hundred and eighteen of those bonds and only five have been dishonoured. That experiment has been worth a great deal more than it costs. It costs some anxiety. Next year I expect to put out about two hundred men if I live. I shall put out more and more each year and I shall expect this good record to continue, simply because the fellows inside are standing for it. The fellow who scales the walls gets the applause that always goes with the deed of daring, but the fellow who goes out after signing a bond, with the superintendent's name to it, 'takes a sneak,' and when he is brought back he is made to feel it."[1]

Conclusion.—Christ declared that figs cannot be grown from the seed of thistles, nor grapes from thorns; and human life has proved that honest,

[1] *Journal of Prison Discipline*, January, 1909, p. 56.

upright, moral characters cannot issue from criminal parents. Mr. Henry M. Boies has truly declared:

"The science of heredity makes it probable that not only the fifty to seventy-five per cent. of criminal moral depravity which has been traced, but nearly every case of it is due to a diseased or disordered organism or function of organs, produced by ancestral influences. Good seed generates sound and healthy fruit, and imperfect parentage can yield only defective offspring."[1]

To prevent discharged or paroled criminals from bringing into the world children predisposed to crime, the state should see that, while a man is in its custody, he shall receive that physical, mental, industrial, and religious education needed to eradicate his criminal tendencies and to prepare him for the parenthood of normal, healthy, moral offspring.

[1] *The Science of Penology*, p. 49.

WEALTH

WEALTH

WEALTH has been defined as "valuable material possessions,"[1] viz: "everything outside of man, procured by human effort, which directly or indirectly satisfies human wants."[2] It comprises "those things, and those things only, which are transferable, are limited in supply, and are directly or indirectly productive of pleasure, or preventive of pain."[3]

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF PROPERTY.—Christ recognised the right of private ownership of property. He never condemned or called into question the right of the individual to acquire, possess, and alienate property.

To Zaccheus, the rich man, Christ said: "To-day I must abide at thy house."[4] Peter owned a house and entertained Christ in it, and was not rebuked.[5]

In the Sermon on the Mount, Christ distinctly recognised the right of private ownership in these words: "Give to every man that asketh of thee, and of him that taketh away thy goods, ask not again."[6]

[1] *Century Dictionary.*
[2] *Outlines of Social Economics*, by George Gunton, p. 20.
[3] Jevons, *Theory of Political Economy*, p. 175.
[4] Luke xix., 5. [5] Matt. viii., 14. [6] Luke vi., 30.

"Sell that thou hast, and give to the poor,"[1] was Christ's advice to the rich young man.

"Sell that ye have and give alms,"[2] Christ commanded. He directed the giving of "that ye have"; He did not question the right to its possession; if He had questioned it, He would have directed the restoration, rather than the giving away of property. Giving implies the ownership of the property transferred, and ownership implies the right to use and dispose of property as its owner wills.

Because Christ and His disciples kept a common purse,[3] some claim that Christ advocated a common ownership of all property.

The community of goods was a custom practised by the Essenes, a Jewish sect of Christ's day, and, therefore, did not originate with Christ and His band of disciples.

Was not the expedient of having a common purse, as adopted by Christ and His disciples, the simplest way for that small body of men who were living together for the purpose of doing a common work—a work unconnected with the accumulation of property—to manage their temporal affairs? Does this teach any lesson other than that Christ considered the care of the needs of the body to be subordinate to His work of extending His kingdom on earth? The way which least interfered with the great work

[1] Mark x., 17–31. [2] Luke xii., 33. [3] John xiii., 29.

He was doing, was the way chosen. Though He and His disciples held all goods in common, He never advocated this practice as a general custom, or commanded its observance by His followers.

After the death of Christ, the practice of community of goods was restricted to the Church at Jerusalem. This custom was not to be found elsewhere; neither at Ephesus, nor at Antioch, nor at Corinth, nor at Rome, is there any trace of it. There was no command, precept, or rule making it obligatory on one to divest himself of his worldly goods in order to be baptised and become a member of the Christian community.[1]

There was not the slightest compulsion exercised over the Christians of Jerusalem to part with their goods. They did so voluntarily and of their own free will, as they wished to devote themselves wholly to the service of God and of their neighbour. The contributions made to the common fund were their free-will offerings, as is seen from the story of Ananias and Sapphira.

Ananias and Sapphira sought to have a foot in both kingdoms, to serve God and mammon. Peter, seeing through their device, made an example of them before the assembled brethren. It was the fraud perpetrated that he punished, the lie to the Holy Ghost. He said to Ananias: "Whilst it remained, did it not remain in thee?

[1] Acts ii., 42–47; iv., 32–35; James v., 1–8; 2 Thess. iii., 6–15; 2 Cor. viii., 9, 13, 14.

And after it was sold, was it not still in thy power?"[1]

There was no law, rule, precept, or command which compelled Ananias to sell his property, and, after he had sold it, there was nothing to oblige him to part with the price he received for it. But when he came to the apostle and pretended that he was giving the whole purchase price to the Church, whilst in reality he was retaining a large share of it, he practised a deceit, for which act of deception he suffered the penalty inflicted.

Christ did not advise the rich young man to put his money into the common purse and join the little band of disciples, but rather to "sell that thou hast," and when the property was converted into money, to distribute it among the poor.[2]

Attitude toward Men of Wealth.—Christ never condemned the man of wealth because of his ownership of wealth. True, he condemned Dives, but it was not because of the riches he possessed, but rather for allowing Lazarus to die of hunger at his door.[3] Whether a man was possessed of wealth or whether he was in poverty made no difference to Christ. Christ came to save mankind. It was the man in whom Christ was interested, not the possessions. There were to Him but two classes of men, not the rich and the poor, not the propertied and the non-propertied, but the

[1] Acts v., 4. [2] Luke xviii., 18–25. [3] Luke vi., 16–31.

saved and the lost. His mission was to seek out and to save the lost. Among His friends were many who were poor in this world's goods and many who were possessed of wealth.

Lazarus, whom Christ loved and raised from the dead, was a man of wealth, and probably a financier.

Christ was a guest at the house of Zaccheus of Jericho,[1] who was "a rich man and chief of the publicans," and at the homes of Simon the Pharisee and Simon of Bethany (if they were not one and the same person), who, also, were men of means.

Christ was not ashamed to acknowledge as His friends, the rich steward of Herod, the wealthy Susanna, and the rich and generous Joanna, the wife of Chusa.[2]

The wealthy centurion of Capernaum "was dear to Him"[3]; so was Zebedee, the father of John, who had "hired servants" and a ship on the lake of Galilee[4]; and also Nicodemus, a man of position and wealth and a ruler of the Jews[5]; while it was His friend, a "rich man of Arimathea,"[6] who begged the body of Christ and laid it in his own tomb.

Attitude toward Wealth.—The chief aim of the individual should be to enter into the

[1] Luke xix., 1, 10.
[2] Luke viii., 2, 3.
[3] Matt. viii., 5, 13.
[4] Mark i., 20.
[5] John ii., 1, 21; viii., 50; xix., 39
[6] Matt. xxvii., 57.

"Kingdom of God." Christ declared that all things else are of relative insignificance: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God," is Christ's injunction; "for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesses."[1]

Christ taught that wealth is of little consequence as compared with the privilege of becoming a citizen of the "Kingdom," for the following fourfold reasons:

First: Wealth is perishable, while citizenship in the "Kingdom" is everlasting.

"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal."[2]

Second: The possession of wealth is only for a little time, while citizenship in the "Kingdom" is for eternity.

"And he spake a parable unto them, saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully:

"And he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits?

"And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods.

[1] Luke xii., 15. [2] Matt. vi., 19, 20.

"And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry.

"But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided?

"So is he that layeth up treasures for himself and is not rich toward God."[1]

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal."[2]

Third: No individual can seek whole-heartedly the "Kingdom of God" and at the same time seek the possession of wealth. Each endeavour requires the dedication of the whole man, and, therefore, one must be sacrificed for the sake of the other.

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon."[3]

Fourth: The individual who has made the accumulation of wealth the sole aim of his life will have difficulty in his latter days in securing entrance into the "Kingdom."

To a certain ruler who had kept all the commandments and who inquired what he should do to inherit eternal life, Christ said:

"Yet lackest thou one thing: sell all that thou

[1] Luke xii., 16–21 [2] Matt. xxv., 46. [3] Matt. vi., 24.

hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me.

"And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich.

"And when Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful, he said, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the Kingdom of God"?

"For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God."[1]

"Seek ye first the Kingdom of God." If men sought, first, entrance into the "Kingdom of God" and made the seeking of wealth subsidiary to their first aim, further discussion of this subject would be unnecessary. But as so many make the accumulation of wealth the first concern of their lives, or endeavour to seek God and mammon at the same time, it may be profitable to consider certain temptations to sin and dangers to the higher life, which lie in the pathway of those who have consecrated themselves to the accumulation and the administration of wealth.

Accumulation of Wealth.—Is the pursuit of wealth, which is the ruling passion of the American people, unchristian?

If the pursuit of wealth is unchristian, then are Christians to be idlers, beggars, or parasites upon the world? Strange as it may seem, many

[1] Luke xviii., 18–25.

have reached this conclusion from their study of the teachings of Christ.

Christ never put a ban on the act of accumulating wealth. He encouraged industry; He commended thrift; He recognised the ambition to acquire property as a worthy ambition, provided it did not become the prime object of life, but was subordinate to love of God and love of mankind. Making the accumulation of wealth the *summum bonum* of life, however, is directly contrary to His teachings.

Despite the wisdom contained in the teachings of Christ, many among the educated and the ignorant, the good and the bad, the rich and the poor, are sacrificing health, friends, and even principles, to gain wealth. Many appear to be hypnotised by the sight of wealth—they seem to lose all power to see anything but gold, to think anything but gold, to do aught but strive for the possession of gold. With them all things are measured in terms of gold and are valued only to the extent of their convertibility into gold. To them the command of Christ reads: "Seek first the possession of wealth, and all things shall be added unto you."

In one of the art galleries at Munich hangs a picture which vividly portrays the life of one who seeks wealth with his whole heart.

It depicts a narrow highway along which is rolling a golden coin, surmounted by a shadowy,

beckoning, graceful figure. The road is crowded with men and women who are rushing madly after the golden coin; their eyes are aflame with eagerness and their faces are drawn with intense desire; on a galloping horse rides a man whose eyes are fixed upon the rolling coin, whose body is bent over the neck of his steed, and whose thoughts are focussed on the wealth ahead; clinging to him is his wife, who, with love and devotion, anxiety and fear, written on her face, is endeavouring to remain close to her husband, but he, in his eagerness to obtain the coveted gold, is unconsciously, unwittingly, and roughly pushing her from him as he feels that she is becoming a drag upon him in his race for wealth. He appears to be oblivious of the men and women in his path, and is urging his horse onward toward the golden goal, trampling upon all who are in his way and leaving behind him a line of broken, bleeding, crushed men and women.

The neglect to use one's talents in the securing of property brings one under the condemnation of Christ. The duty of man is to earn sufficient for his own livelihood and for those who are dependent upon him.

Wealth stands for a more abundant life, while poverty implies a narrow, cramped existence. Wealth is of value in so far as it forms the material basis upon which human life may be developed.

While wealth is good, its pursuit is not worthy of supreme devotion; it is not an end in itself, it is but a subordinate element in the one great end of making the world, our fellows and ourselves, what God would have us. It is indispensable as an instrument, but as a standard, or an end in itself, it is degrading.

There is a definite personal responsibility resting upon the individual for the employment of such talents, gifts, opportunities, and property as he may possess. Over against the right to own property, Christianity places a corresponding duty on its possessor, viz: the paramount obligation to use property for the benefit of our fellow men. Whatever one may own, whether talents or property, that becomes an opportunity for action; and all opportunities are given that the steward may make them bear interest.[1]

Faithfulness to one's duties in the accumulation of property is commended by Christ, while unfaithfulness He distinctly condemned. He declared that if one cannot be faithful to the unrighteous mammon, he is unfit to be entrusted with the true riches.

"He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust in much.

"If, therefore, ye have not been faithful in the

[1] Matt. xxv., 14–30; Luke xix., 11–27.

unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches?

"And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?"[1]

It is a common saying in this twentieth century, that it is impossible for a man to be in business and at the same time to live a Christian life; that the teachings of Christ, if applied to business dealings, would, invariably, cause bankruptcy.

History, however, records the indisputable fact, that there have been Christians who have amassed fortunes in trade, and what has been done in the past we may confidently expect can be accomplished to-day and to-morrow.

Credit—that trust and confidence which is reposed in the ability and intention of a purchaser to make payment at some future time—is the basis of all business life. Without credit, or faith in the honesty of one another, business on a large scale would cease. It is stated upon recognised authority that there are 1,500,000 business houses in the United States, and the aggregate volume of business transacted by them in 1909 was $88,000,000,000. There is but $3,125,000,000 in currency in the United States, which would provide $2100 in actual money to each concern in business. These figures signify that 96 per cent. of this vast volume of business in

[1] Luke xvi., 10–12.

1909 was handled on credit, and that but 4 per cent. of actual money figured in the transactions. Honesty is enthroned in the business world, and practically all business men kneel at her shrine and live according to her dictates.

Some men enter trade or business with the idea that trade or business is an illicit calling, and that to succeed they must adopt sharp practices or secure unfair advantages.

In the parable of the talents, Christ said:

"Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same, and made them other five talents. . . .

"His lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord."[1]

If trade or business were a low, debasing calling, Christ would not have commended the successful trader and declared him worthy to enter into the joy of his lord.

The manufacturer who transforms the crude material into something of use to humanity, by risking his capital and expending his time and strength, ought to receive a profit on the sale of the manufactured products as rightfully as the labourer receives a daily wage for his services.

The trader, the merchant, who gathers from afar

[1] Matt. xxv., 16, 21.

supplies and comforts necessary for the people of the locality in which he trades, and who spends his time and risks his capital in the collection, transportation, and handling of these articles, should obtain a profit on the sale of such goods.

If the manufacturer and the merchant are entitled to receive a profit on the sale of their goods, what is the amount of profit that would be just and equitable?

Prices are regulated very largely by the law of supply and demand. The individual trader, unless he possesses a monopoly, does not settle the price, but is bound by the market price, and if he ignores it he is in danger of bankruptcy.

Men who have a practical monopoly through the ownership or control of one or more lines of industry, or of the supply of raw materials, are often in the position to fix the prices arbitrarily for their products. But even though they have this power, by using it unfairly and unjustly they run a grave financial risk, and it is only in very exceptional cases that they are unhampered and free to extort from the people all the profit they may desire.

The production of wealth in the United States is increasing so rapidly that its owners are persistently seeking new fields for investment, and it is daily becoming more difficult to find employment for capital even at nominal returns. It is a well-known fact that there is a large amount

of idle capital in the control of enterprising men who are ready to enter any specific field of production should the profits therein offer a sufficient inducement.

When large profits are in prospect, another combination is formed, and competition then ensues and operates with such an intensity that the profits become reduced to a minimum and the weaker competitor is compelled to sell out to the stronger, or to go out of business.

This competition need not be direct, however, for the fear of competition operates, to a certain extent, almost as effectually as the competition itself in preventing extortionate charges.

Another partial check to the abuse of power lies in the fact that there are on the market substitutes for nearly all articles of commerce, which substitutes would be used exclusively if a cheaper price were made as an inducement. There are few, if any, of the commodities on which we depend for food, shelter, and clothing, which the people would not dispense with if prices rose too high. Prof. Giddings has well expressed this human trait in the following statement:

"When one group of producers demands unusually high prices, all other groups of producers can very considerably increase their sales in virtue of that law of human nature according to which men can and do, to a great extent, substitute one group of conveniences and pleasures for another, and dis-

tribute their expenditures at all times in such a way as to obtain the greatest satisfaction for a given outlay."

The incessant competition that is being carried on by the producers of different commodities which are claimed to satisfy some particular class of need, cannot be done away with by the monopoly of any one of them. This is probably the chief explanation for the comparatively low prices charged by the Standard Oil Company. As an illuminant, oil is competing with gas, candles, and electricity, and unless the Standard Oil monopoly were extended to include these and other possible illuminants, the Company's prices could not, for any length of time, be determined by the pressure of the need for artificial light.

To avoid inviting competition, prices must be kept within reasonable limits. Unless a monopoly is founded on some exclusive governmental privilege, it cannot long exist if it is not based upon superior excellence of the product, coupled with economy of manufacture, and a reasonable charge to the public.

As prices are governed largely by the law of trade, other elements besides the price of the article may enter into the business transaction, *i.e.*:

1. Misrepresentation as to the quality of the article.

2. Misrepresentation as to the use for which the article may be put.

3. Misrepresentation as to the quantity delivered.

Reputation is the view held by the world with regard to one's character and life. It attaches to every human being, and, in the long run, is as accurate a picture of one's qualities, peculiarities, and principles, as is a silhouette of one's body.

Success or failure in business depends to a large extent on the reputation one has earned. If a man is looked upon as a crooked or sharp dealer, few care to trade with him; but if he is considered honest and square in his dealings, people trust him and give him their trade.

From a material standpoint, "Honesty is the best policy"; from a Christian standpoint, it is the only policy, the only principle which should guide one's acts.

In modern practice, commerical transactions representing billions of dollars per annum are made on the strength of such documents as bills of lading, insurance policies, and bills of exchange, because of the people's faith in the business integrity of the firms involved in the transaction.

"Insurance against dishonesty is as common as against any other catastrophe; the companies stake their business upon the high estimate that their risks are 98 per cent. honest and the profits of their business show that this is true. Of credits extended by commercial houses the overwhelming majority are paid as a matter of course; the losses by bad debts would

be enormous at 3 per cent. of the transactions; their common average range is from $\frac{1}{10}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 per cent.; and the premiums of the credit insurance companies are based on this experience."[1]

If, however, under present conditions, it is impossible for a merchant to carry on business on Christian principles without ultimately being forced into bankruptcy, what course ought he to pursue? In an address to law students on the subject of honesty, Abraham Lincoln said:

"Resolve to be honest at all events; and if, in your own judgment, you cannot be an honest lawyer, resolve to be honest without being a lawyer. Choose some other occupation, rather than one in the choosing of which you do, in advance, consent to be a knave."

Nineteen hundred years ago, men suffered even unto death for the sake of their Christian religion. To-day, when Christianity and business methods come into conflict, are Christians willing to follow the example of their forefathers to the extent of giving up the chance of increasing their income for the sake of their religion?

Christ asked: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" Is this life all there is to a human soul? If it is, then is there truth in Christ's saying: "Man's life consisteth not in the abundance of his pos-

[1] Edward D. Page, *Morals in Modern Business*, p. 5.

sessions"? Wealth in itself is not a happiness producer. Wealth may be an aid to the securing of happiness, but, in itself, is not the source of happiness. Happiness is the result of living the "Simple Life," and the "Simple Life" depends solely on the state of the mind. It is not an outward, but an inward condition. It has to do, not with material objects, but with life here and now.

To attain the "Simple Life," one must choose a goal; and putting aside all other aims, all other desires, all other ambitions, walk continually, enthusiastically, and unswervingly toward that one chosen ideal. Singleness of aim, directness of purpose, and loyalty to the adopted mission is the secret of the real simplicity of life.

The degree of happiness to be enjoyed on one's earthly journey depends on one's choice of a goal. The higher and nobler the purpose of life, the purer and more satisfying will be the happiness obtainable. "Seek first the kingdom of God," said Christ, and "all these things shall be added unto you."

If this life is not the end of the soul's existence, then should not this present brief pilgrimage be sacrificed in order to possess the endless life in the abode beyond the grave?

Christ declared: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall

lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it."[1]

To sacrifice the lower for the higher, present material gains for spiritual possessions, is a duty entailed on the individual by Christ. By choosing a life patterned after the Master, the pursuit of wealth must be subordinated to the development of the best within. The inevitable result of such a choice will be, not only happiness here and now, but happiness which will not "perish with this corporeal clod."

Administration of Wealth.—"The Gospel has prescribed no regulations as to how we are to use (riches), but it leaves us in no doubt that we are to regard ourselves not as owners but as administrators in the service of our neighbour,"[2] says Prof. Adolf Harnack.

Wealth is a mighty power, and it may be a dangerous power for him who holds and uses it.

Wealth should be used, for its non-use renders it valueless; and to bury the talent is specifically condemned by Christ.

Wealth should be used as Christ used His power, viz: for the good of others.

Clement of Alexandria said: "Earthly property should be considered in the light of a staff, an instrument for good uses."[3]

Dr. Martin B. Anderson has written: "With

[1] Matt. xvi., 24, 25. [2] *What is Christianity?* p. 101.
[3] *The Salvation of Rich Men.*

the Christian, wealth is mainly to be valued as the evidence of industry and self-denial on the part of its possessor, and as a means of elevating, purifying, and saving men."[1]

"The principle that wealth is a trust held for the general good is not to be disputed [says Prof. Charles H. Cooley], but latitude must be left to individual conceptions of what the general good is. These are matters not for formulas or sumptuary laws, but for conscience. To set up any other standard would be to suppress individuality and do more harm than good."[2]

"Jesus was not interested in the mechanism of distribution; he could have known nothing of it as it exists to-day; but that does not exempt it from the application of the test of his spirit."[3]

It is a common saying, and one to which many people adhere, that it matters little how money is spent so long as it is not hoarded; that to hoard money is a wrong against society, for the hoarding of it renders it valueless; that to keep money in circulation is the duty resting upon its possessors; and that he who spends money freely is a public benefactor.

Mr. John C. Van Dyke has written: "If the millions of the millionaire require use to make them valuable, then the next proposition follows

[1] *Papers and Addresses*, p. 220. [2] *Social Organisation*, p. 306.
[3] *The Churches and the Wage-Earners*, by C. Bertrand Thompson, p. 94.

of itself: The millions cannot be used without benefiting other people as well as their owner."[1]

Is this statement as to the spender of money being a public benefactor an exact truth? Is not the community affected for good or for ill in accordance with the manner in which money is spent?

The answer to these questions must be looked for in three directions: *first*, on the effect the expenditure of money has upon the spender; *second*, on the effect the expenditure of money has upon those who receive it; *third*, on the effect the expenditure of money has upon the community at large.

First: It is axiomatic that the spending of money on horse-racing, gambling, liquor, and social vice has no good effect upon the spender. It is also a well-recognised fact that the spending of money for personal luxuries and for the gratification of pride inevitably weakens the character of the spender. If the effect of spending money tends to narrow or degrade the spender, the money has been ill spent; but if it has enlarged and ennobled his character, the money has been well spent.

Second: The spending of money sets people to work, and it is therefore the spender who determines the kind of work people shall do. Does it do the receiver good when the money encourages

[1] *The Money God*, p. 123.

him to gain his living by pandering to the baser animal nature of man, through gambling, liquor, and the social vice; or does it encourage him to find employment in a business which has an elevating influence? If the materials or services furnished have an injurious effect on the seller, then the more money that is spent for such materials and services, the greater is the harm done.

Third: That which is purchased with the money put into circulation is of the utmost importance to society.

Does the money spent on horse-racing, gambling, liquor, and the social vice benefit the community? Does it profit society to have money used to perpetuate such callings? Does the money put in circulation through these channels tend to increase the social welfare of the people?

Would the running of a city "wide-open," as some people advocate, so as to stimulate and increase the spending of money, be of value to the community and to the general welfare of its citizens?

If the commodities the money buys are of value to the community, and if the services the money buys tend to ennoble manhood and womanhood, then the money is well spent.

If the commodities the money purchases cause a deterioration in the physical, mental, or moral being, and if the services the money purchases

degrade the spender or the receiver, then such expenditure is productive of harm.

Whatever embitters, degrades, or enslaves one member of society injures the whole social body, for all beings composing society are knit together so closely that the lives of all are affected by the life of each member.

Much greater is the damage done to society through the putting of money into a business which is injurious to society, than is the good gained by the free circulation of that amount of money.

But do mere extravagances, such as the purchasing of a luxurious home beyond the needs of the owner, the setting of a table with costly foods beyond the requirements of the members of the household, the buying of expensive clothing beyond the necessities of the individual, deserve condemnation? Rather, do they not deserve commendation because of their aid in the distribution of wealth and the furnishing of wholesome employment to those who might otherwise be in want?

Was the defence offered by Louis XIV. of France to his extravagant expenditure on his frivolous court a just and correct one: "When a king makes a great outlay, he gives alms"?

This question might be considered from two aspects: first, have we a right to consume for our pleasures more than a reasonable amount of

money; second, are we justified in being so extravagant as to make our expenditures an ostentatious display of wealth?

First: Have we a right to consume for our pleasures more than a reasonable amount of money?

Money may be used for altruistic or for selfish ends. If used for self, only such amount should be expended as would reasonably take care of the individual in his housing, food, clothes, and pleasures,—all excess expenditures being unchristian. What is meant by modest, unostentatious living is almost impossible to explain, for there exist different standards for different conditions.

"The question whether a given commodity is to be considered as a decency or a luxury is obviously one to which no answer can be given," remarks Prof. Senior, "unless the place, the time, and the rank of the individual using it be specified."

There are almost as many definitions and conceptions of the term luxury as there are writers upon the subject. Adam Smith states his views as follows:

"Consumable commodities are either necessaries or luxuries. By necessaries I understand not only the commodities which are indispensably necessary for the support of life, but whatever the custom of the country renders it indecent for creditable people,

even of the lowest order, to be without. . . . All other things I call luxuries."

Professor Ely's conception is that "luxuries are things which minister to such undesirable wants as love of display, vanity, or selfish desire to exalt one's self above one's fellows and thus to produce separation."

M. Baudrillat says in substance that everything superfluous is a luxury; while J. N. Say characterises as luxuries those commodities which are both superfluous and dear.

M. de Laveleye says: "I designate as an object of luxury everything that does not answer to some primary need, and which, costing much money and consequently much labour, is within the reach of only a small number of persons."[1]

Prof. Thomas Francis Moran has wisely said:

"It is not reasonable to place an absolute ban upon luxuries, and place art, music, and foreign travel in the same category with gluttony, debauchery, and sensuality. It is certainly a fact that many of the so-called luxuries are highly conducive to better living. . . . It must be apparent, then, that there are luxuries which ennoble and luxuries which degrade, those which tend to make possible the highest self-realisation of the individual and the race, and those which militate against such a happy issue."[2]

[1] "Morals of Luxury," *Popular Science Monthly*, March, 1881.

[2] "Ethics of Wealth," *Am. Journal of Sociology*, vol. vi., p. 834.

The luxuries an individual purchases should be governed by the Christian ideal—that is, the purchasing of only those things which tend to support, upbuild, ennoble, and dignify life, and awaken and cultivate all the powers of being.

Prof. Richard T. Ely wisely sums up a Christian's duty regarding the purchase of luxuries in these words:

"A Christian may say, If I love my neighbour as myself, my necessities are as important as his. True, but my comforts are not as important as his necessities, nor are my luxuries and superfluities as important as my neighbour's comforts. Luxury can never be indulged in by a Christian so long as he can minister to the well-being of others, and supply them with material goods helpful for their development; and this forever renders luxury an impossibility for a Christian."[1]

Second: Ostentatious display of wealth—the spending for one's self more than is reasonably required, while many human beings are in dire need of the barest necessities of life—fosters discontent, awakens envy, and creates class hatred.

The newspapers report, with glaring headlines and large illustrations, all displays of luxury. It is impossible for a rich man or woman who spends money on a large scale for a social function to keep such act from being reported to the

[1] *Social Aspects of Christianity*, pp. 36, 37.

world. In our large cities, the examples of Cleopatra and Lucullus in the scattering of wealth for the purchase of luxuries are equalled by hundreds of our present-day aristocrats. The effect of such large expenditure is that, while many are given employment, this good is more than offset by the feelings of discontent, envy, and hatred which are born in the hearts of those less fortunate in possessing wealth. The reports of the garish display and foolish extravagance of the rich cause socialism and anarchy to thrive and tend to undermine individual character and disintegrate social life.

The "yellow journals" and many serious publications are continually warning the public that the trend of American national life is downward as a result of the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few citizens. Comparisons are made between the conditions which exist in America to-day and those which existed in the latter days of Babylon, of Greece, and of Rome. Insistence is placed upon the fact that these old nations fell because the wealth was owned by but a few of the people, and the lesson drawn is, that the United States is rapidly going the way of these ancient empires—to destruction and to final extinction.

Do these comparisons warrant any such conclusion? History reveals the fact that every ancient nation that became a leader in the de-

velopment of human enlightenment and well-being has fallen into decay. Looking back through the years, it is easy to discern the causes that placed one people after another in the van of human progress, as well as the reasons for their successive degradation. The life of the people and the conditions surrounding their country have given an appearance of variety to these causes, but in all cases the main features have been the same. The principles that underly all those changes and conditions suffer no variation through the ages. The fate which befell the Babylonian, the Greek, and the Roman Empires will be repeated in the future, should the conditions which existed in those countries be reproduced in any nation of the present day.

So far as the concentration of wealth in the hands of the few is concerned, so far is the comparison between these old nations and our country correct. But right here the divergence begins. Wealth in those ancient countries was the symbol of ease. The rich men of Rome, as well as of Greece and of Babylon, lived unto themselves. Their ambition was to enjoy all luxuries and to spend only for the gratification of the senses. No thought was given to the good they might do for their fellows by opening up new lines of activity wherein men could find profitable employment. No effort was made to use their wealth for the uplifting of humanity by dignify-

ing labour and providing work for the labourer. Their money was withdrawn from the avenues of trade and invested in the pleasures and in the unsubstantials of life. Public sentiment, debased by the mode of life of the so-called upper classes, upheld and applauded the wealthy idlers in the manner in which they wasted their substance and abused their powers. Babylon, Greece, and Rome fell, not because wealth was concentrated, but because wealth was devoted to personal selfish enjoyment. So long as the wealth of a nation is devoted to luxurious living instead of being employed in the upbuilding of the individual life, the nation will decay and ultimately die and disappear.

The Curses of Money.—Wealth may prove a curse in innumerable ways, some of the most familiar being the following:

(1) To the man who makes the attainment of wealth the sole aim of his life.

Money worship—the belief that money alone is omnipotent—inevitably produces disappointment, dissatisfaction, discontent; for possession chloroforms desire; and, like the blue-winged butterfly of Cashmere,

> "The lovely toy so fiercely sought
> Hath lost its charms by being caught."

(2) To the man who has hoarded wealth to an

amount beyond the reasonable requirements of himself and his dependents.

With increase of wealth, comes a corresponding increase of labour, thought, and anxiety, for which the owner receives no adequate return. The labour and capacity required to keep wealth are often greater than were required to amass it; so that the sunset of life, instead of fulfilling the dreams of youth, by being a period of ease and peaceful happiness, becomes a time when the rich man tremulously staggers under his load of cares and responsibilities.

(3) To the man who is born to wealth.

The knowledge that a man possesses wealth sufficient to relieve him from the ordinary necessity of working for his living, in all but exceptional cases, strikes with paralysis the motives to personal exertion, and thereby prevents the development of the fullest and richest in manhood.

(4) To the man who has gained wealth by some kind of robbery, whether legalised or not, and who, having repented, desires to use his wealth for the good of mankind.

Wealth is considered by many to be entirely impersonal, unimpressionable, and untainted by the sins of its owner. This may be so, but in the distribution of wealth, the life of its distributor is temporarily impressed upon it, making it productive of good or of evil. Therefore, he who has obtained wealth by wrecking proper-

ties, destroying securities, violating laws, tampering with courts, bribing city councils, and grinding the life out of human beings, ought to think well on this fact when he attempts to distribute his wealth for the uplift of mankind.

To give to a church money gained by nefarious methods may do some good, but it will also be productive of much harm, if the church which accepts it is aware of how the money was obtained, for it will be tempted to refrain from criticising the financial methods of the donor, and by its silence will condone such practices. Though the acceptance of such money be coupled with no conditions, the church will not be apt to assail the deeds of the man who has placed it under obligations, and the pulpit will find it almost impossible to condemn the wrongs, the doing of which enabled the donor to give the money. It is, therefore, reasonable to expect that the acceptance of tainted money will muzzle the pulpit so that no message will be forthcoming to guide the young away from those business paths which degrade manhood.

In accepting money which had been gained unlawfully or unrighteously, a college would probably cease condemning the iniquitious methods practised by the man who gave the endowment. Few collegiate institutions would accept money and then condemn the way that such money was gained by the donor. Few colleges would accept

money, whether tainted by evil or honestly earned, without paying honour to the donor; and to pay honour to a man for a gift of that which was not honestly or honourably gained, would incite the students to do those things which it is the mission of colleges to condemn.

If the pernicious manner in which the wealth was gained could be hidden from mankind, such gifts to churches and colleges would be productive of good; but in this twentieth century, when the acts of men are observed and paraded through the columns of the daily press, no unlawful or unchristian act can long remain in secrecy.

If the institution and the public are ignorant of the evil sources from which the money came, no contamination follows the coin; but if it is known that the source from which the money came was evil, then but little good can come to those who receive it.

Could anything cut more deeply than a refusal to accept a proffered gift of money on account of the way in which it had been earned? He who endeavours to quiet the protests of his conscience against wrong-doing, by promising to use wealth unjustly gained for the benefit of mankind, should realise clearly the difficulty he will meet in putting tainted money to good uses, and the mortification he may experience in an attempt to use it for the uplift of man. Further, he should realise that "devotion to charity of the superfluity of wealth

unscrupulously gained" will redeem his life no more than did the act of the "man with one wooden leg, who stole a pair of boots and gave away the odd boot in charity."

THE BLESSINGS OF MONEY.—To a Christian, the possession of wealth becomes a blessing. To be a Christian is to "seek first the kingdom of God," to serve but one Master, Jesus Christ; and to love wholeheartedly our Father in heaven and our brothers on earth.

To a Christian, wealth is not an end, but a means; not the goal of ambition, but a power for good.

To give for the sake of giving, or for ostentatious glory, or to win approbation from one's fellows, does not obtain commendation from Christ. "Verily . . . they have their reward."

The ways in which money may be spent in order to be of service to the community and to be of lasting benefit to the people are innumerable.

Andrew Carnegie, from his wide experience, has written: "It is well to remember that it requires the exercise of not less ability than that which acquires it, to use wealth so as to be really beneficial to the community."[1]

The indiscriminate giving of alms may be productive of unlimited evil. The mere giving of money is not necessarily charity. It may be given in such a way as to destroy the self-respect

[1] *Gospel of Wealth*, p. 10.

of the recipients, and thereby train up a class willing to live upon the public bounty and to shirk the responsibilities of using their talents for self-development and for the good of mankind.

He who supplies the wants of the poor in such a way as to lessen their motives to labour, and inculcates in them a desire to live upon the munificence of the public, so far trains them to beggary and to crime.

"In bestowing charity [says Andrew Carnegie] the main consideration should be to help those who will help themselves; to provide part of the means by which those who desire to improve may do so; to give those who desire to rise the aids by which they may rise; to assist, but rarely or never to do all."[1]

Mr. Carnegie's enumeration of what he deems to be the "best fields of philanthropy" is as follows: colleges and universities, a free library "provided the community will accept and maintain it as a public institution," "the founding or extension of hospitals, medical colleges, laboratories, and other institutions connected with the alleviation of human suffering, and especially with the prevention rather than the cure of human ills"; public parks, "always provided that the community undertakes to maintain, beautify, and preserve them inviolate"; "providing our cities with halls suitable for meetings of all kinds, and

[1] *Gospel of Wealth*, p. 17.

for concerts of elevating music"; public swimming baths for the people when the city agrees "to maintain them at its own expense"; building or repairing churches, but "the support of the church should be upon its own people."[1]

Better, by far, than the suggestions made by Mr. Carnegie for the physical, mental, moral, and spiritual improvement of the less fortunate of mankind, is the counsel of Emil, that "the most earnest effort of every true friend of the poor must always be directed toward making poor-relief itself superfluous."

Commendable, indeed, is the welfare work which is being carried on in many manufacturing establishments to-day. Much good is accomplished by "social secretaries," or persons who devote their time to looking after the welfare of the employees during working hours, as well as by means of rest, lunch and club rooms, gymnasia, baths, libraries, old-age pensions, insurance against accidents, and beneficiary societies.

While libraries, gymnasia, and club rooms may be of considerable benefit to employees, yet if the employees receive wages which are insufficient to provide a fairly proper and decent standard of living for themselves and their families, the money spent in equipping and maintaining such establishments for industrial betterment, might better be used in increasing the wages of the un-

[1] *Gospel of Wealth*, pp. 19–41.

derpaid employees, for a man who earns less than is necessary for the support of his family needs nothing so much as more pay.

The chief duty of an employer of labour is to pay his employees a living wage. But, say the employers, we cannot pay higher wages than do our competitors and remain in the business arena. There is much truth in this statement, but so long as the employer makes no attempt to bring about the establishment of a living wage as a minimum in the industry in which he is engaged, he is neglecting his Christian duty, and thus he becomes responsible for the evils arising out of the necessity which is laid upon his employees of obtaining the additional amount requisite to provide the decencies of life. To eke out the family income, so as to meet the absolutely necessary expenses, the wife is often compelled to seek employment outside the home, leaving the young children uncared for, or the older children are obliged to forego the advantages of schooling in order that they may add their mite to the family purse; or boarders must be taken even at the expense of overcrowding and loss of privacy. The consequences which follow as a result of a man being paid a wage insufficient for the support of his family are infant mortality, immorality, truancy, illiteracy, juvenile delinquency, stunted vitality, disease, "progressive deterioration," and poor citizenship.

"What elements must enter into the minimum standard of family support?" asked Charles R. Henderson. In reply, Mr. Henderson said:

"It is not difficult to answer this part of the question. In every civilised country, in every part of each land, in town and in rural communities, certain things are necessary to the life of mortal beings. These things may be roughly classified under the heads food and drink, shelter, clothing, light and fuel, furniture and furnishings, means of transportation (car-fares), provisions for sickness and accidents, dental, surgical, and other care of health, recreation, and incidental but unavoidable expenses. In order that these material means may be continuously supplied even during periods when the bread-winner cannot work and earn, as in sickness, unemployment, and old age, there must be some kind of a savings or insurance fund. Not one of these elements can be left out; and, if any one is omitted, life ceases or degrading alms must eke out the income."[1]

Many of the social evils, if traced to their source, will be found to be the outcome of a wage insufficient for the support of life. Not only are the men who employ labour responsible for the downfall and degradation of their employees, but even women, in some cases, share in causing such misery. Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch has said:

[1] *Social Duties*, p. 54.

"Take a manufacturer. Assume he has a wife who is ambitious for social honours. She spends more than his income really warrants. To meet her demands, he must economise somewhere. He reduces the wages of the hundred girls employed in his factory, or at least denies them the increase which the increased cost of living makes necessary to them. When the crisis comes to these poor girls, 99 out of the 100 may remain good, and one goes astray. Is not that woman responsible for that wreck of at least one soul?"

Waldron's handbook of *Currency and Wealth* contains the following estimate of incomes earned in the United States:

"One in twenty of the families is able to secure an income of $3000 a year and over.

"Two-thirds of the families get less than $900 per year.

"More than one-half gets less than $600 per year.

"While more than 4,000,000 families, comprising one-third of the nation, must get along on an income of less than $400 per year."

In most of the large cities of the United States, many department-store girls are paid wages which are about $2.00 a week less than is necessary for their support while living independently; and a large majority of common unskilled day labourers receive in annual wages $100 or more less than the amount necessary to maintain a proper

standard of living for their families. This condition compels the underpaid department-store girls, who are living away from home and are dependent solely upon their earnings, to either deprive themselves of some of the things requisite for a healthy mode of life, or to earn outside of store hours the additional sums necessary for their support. While the underpaid day labourer is forced to deprive his family of sanitary and uncrowded housing, sufficient and wholesome food, proper clothing, and the advantages of American life, or else some of the members of his family must become wage-earners to the detriment of the integrity of the family and to the injury of the social body.

The Christian's duty to love one's neighbour implies the paying to one's employee a wage which is at least sufficient to enable him to support his family in a healthful and decent manner.

An employer who is making money out of the labour of men and women should conduct his business in such a way that his employees will not be degraded, or discouraged, or embittered by the employment.

The employee is affected, physically, mentally, morally, and socially, for good or ill, by the work he is doing, by the conditions under which the work is done, by the influences surrounding him in his work, and by the relationship which exists between him and his employer.

The employer should remember that whoever works for him, whether it be the mechanic in his shop, the girl behind his counter, the hostler in his stable, or the maid in his kitchen, is a child of God and is his brother or sister. His attitude toward them should be, how much good can I do them? rather than, how much profit can I make out of them?

How to use wealth so as to derive from it the greatest amount of personal benefit is clearly set forth in the inscription written by Mr. Watts beneath the picture of a dead man: "What I saved, I lost; what I spent, I had; what I gave, I have."

Corporations.—One of the earliest social manifestations about which we have any knowledge is the practice of co-operation. It had its birth in man's instinct for self-protection and self-preservation, and in the earliest stages of social development took the form of village communities, clans, tribes, and nations. Step by step in the progress of civilisation this spirit of association has been developing in the social and political life and in the industrial and commercial world.

Although slower in its development than the social and political movements, the industrial evolution has been going on, steadily and persistently, through various forms of organisation, until our age is confronted with vast combinations of tremendous and far-reaching power.

This movement has developed from the individual in business to the partnership, from the partnership to the small corporation, from the small corporation to the pool, from the pool to the trust, and from the trust to the giant corporation.

The giant corporation is the latest phase in the growth of the principle of co-operation, and is solely the result of the evolution of industrial progress amid certain well-known natural economic conditions, and is in no sense an excrescence on the commercial and industrial body politic.

Ninety per cent. of all business transacted in the United States is done by corporations. The corporation is here to stay and is a power that must be faced and reckoned with. It has a "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" character, and while its good features are of incalculable value, its evil tendencies constitute a grave danger.

Every corporation or consolidation of corporations is not necessarily a public danger or a social evil. Corporations being organised to enable men, as a collective body, to do what each member may do as an individual, are no better and no worse than the individuals who manage them. The corporate charter is only a cloak covering the men upon whom it rests.

"Corporations have no souls," is the common maxim. This is understood to mean that corporations are endowed by law with all the rights

of property, while they are emancipated from its corresponding duties.

"In joining to create a corporation, a man isolates a certain part of himself, a certain wish or purpose, and sends it off by itself, so to speak, to work independently of the rest of his aims and impulses. Other men do the same, and the result is essentially mechanical and not human. The man, as a moral whole, is not in it; it is only a fagot of parallel interests." [1]

Many corporate directors recognise but one duty, that of making the corporation pay dividends. Corporate officers are men placed in power to produce results. What methods they pursue to gain results are but too often unquestioned, and, as a consequence, the officers are apt to go to any length in order to hold their positions and to obtain an increase in their salaries. If the price of the finished product can be raised without losing the market, this course will be adopted; if secret rebates or hidden preferences can be secured, often these will be accepted; if the wages of labour can be forced downward, that will be done. "Do everything to increase the dividends," is the order given by the stockholders.

In many instances, there is no human touch between the officers of the corporation and its servants. Dollars and dividends are the only

[1] Cooley on *Personal Competition*, p. 110.

things corporately considered, man being viewed as a mere cog in the great corporate machine. The prevailing idea that the only bond between the employer and employee is that which money has created, and that when money has been exchanged for work the bond ceases, is directly in conflict with the fundamental teachings of Christ.

A great English economist has remarked that "factory acts are a disgrace." By this he meant that, in these civilised days, it ought not to have been necessary to enact laws regulating the employment of human beings, nor to have prescribed severe penalties in order to induce men to cease from treating their employees as mere machines. Anyone who reads the legal provisions regarding women's and children's labour will understand this point.

To-day, men are doing under the corporate cloak that which they would not dare to do in the open. They are doing through others what they would fear to do themselves. A corporation, representing, as it does, the interests of many, is assumed to represent the composite wishes of its stockholders. The manager excuses his acts by insisting that he is but obeying the orders of the officers of the corporation; the officers shift their responsibility upon the shoulders of the directors; while the directors lay the blame upon the stockholders; and the stockholders deny liability by pleading ignorance of what the corporation does.

Men who share in the profits of a corporation ought, in all fairness, to share in the responsibilities for the right and just use of the corporate franchise and property, in the same way as the individual proprietor suffers for the misuse of his property and his unfair methods of conducting business.

Prof. Edward A. Ross says:

"The man who picks pockets with a railway rebate, murders with an adulterant instead of a bludgeon, burglarises with a 'rake-off' instead of a jimmy, cheats with a company prospectus instead of a deck of cards, or scuttles his town instead of a ship, does not feel on his brow the brand of a malefactor. . . .

"The providing of unsuspecting passengers with 'cork' life-preservers secretly loaded with bars of iron to make up for their deficiency in weight of cork, is spiritually akin to the treachery of Joab, who, taking Amasa by the beard 'to kiss him,' smote Amasa 'in the fifth rib'; but it wears a very different aspect. . . .

"The key to the criminaloid is not evil impulse, but moral insensibility. . . . Too squeamish and too prudent to practise treachery, brutality, and violence himself, he takes care to work through middlemen. . . . He shows them the goal, provides the money, insists on 'results,' but vehemently declines to know the foul methods by which alone his understrappers can get these 'results.' Not to bribe, but to employ and finance the briber; not to lie, but to admit to your editorial columns 'paying matter'; not to commit perjury, but to hire men to

homestead, and to make over to you claims they have sworn were entered in good faith and without collusion; not to cheat, but to promise a 'rake-off' to a mysterious go-between in case your just assessment is cut down; not to rob on the highway, but to make the carrier pay you a rebate on your rival's shipments; not to shed innocent blood, but to bribe inspectors to overlook your neglect to install safety appliances: such are the ways of the criminaloid. He is a buyer rather than a practitioner of sin, and his middlemen spare him unpleasant details. . . .

"Blame not the tool, but the hand that moves the tool" [is the wise advice given by Prof. Ross].[1]

Dr. Liddon warns us that "there is no such thing as putting personal responsibility into commission and hoping that God will settle accounts, not with us, but with our commissioners."[2]

There is no occupation open to respectable men surrounded by greater moral dangers than that of making money in trade. This is so because men often fail to realise that every economic question is a social question, and that every social question is a moral question. The methods by which wealth is produced and distributed act directly on the lives of the people, vitally affecting their health and morals.

Men, to-day, have fallen under the glamour of large numbers. The placing of several noughts

[1] *Sin and Society*, pp. 7, 9, 50–53, 117.
[2] *Sermons on the Old Testament*, p. 218.

after an initial figure tends to produce astigmatism. The present need is the piercing of all economic and industrial questions with the pointed query: "Is it right, is it Christian?"

To employ young, uneducated children at a low wage has proved, time and again, to be an economic loss, while the employment of older children, who have had schooling, at a larger wage, has shown that this increased efficiency has more than offset the increased wage.

"Improved sanitary conditions mean better health, and better health means better work," declares George W. Perkins, Chairman of the Finance Committee of the International Harvester Co.

Practical experience indicates that for an employer to treat his employees as brothers in Christ, is to employ the best business policy. Some of the American captains of industry are coming to this conclusion, and hardly a week passes without the newspapers recording the action of some great corporation in adopting rules or policies which are intended to better the conditions surrounding the lives of the workers.

The time for the adoption of the Sermon on the Mount as a by-law of corporate organisations is still a long way off, and, until it becomes embodied in corporate life, means must be found for the establishment of Christ's teachings in the industrial and commercial world.

Some of the evil conditions in corporate life may be uprooted and abolished by the adoption of the following remedies:

First: Legal compulsory publicity. The first concern of the government which grants charters of incorporation ought to be, to see that its corporate offsprings are conducting business legitimately and are not violating any of the laws. Its second concern ought to be, the giving to the public of all such information as would affect the reasonable judgment of a man in determining whether he should or should not invest in a particular enterprise.

Second: A public opinion should be created which would demand that a man be held just as accountable for his acts as a director as he is held accountable for his acts as an individual, and would place upon the shoulders of the individual directors the responsibility for all the acts of the corporation, no matter who may actively participate in them.

Third: Socially ostracise the man who is misusing his wealth or his power.

"Judge not, that ye be not judged." By this command, Christ distinctly declared that an individual has no right to judge another on circumstantial or hearsay evidence, nor on appearances no matter how damaging such appearances may seem.

If one knows, as a fact, that a certain individual

has committed a sin or a crime, then Christ's special teaching on social ostracism may be safely and properly applied.

To His disciples, Christ said:

"And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you:

"And heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.

"But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say,

"Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you: notwithstanding ye be sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you."[1]

The emphasis in these verses is upon the last clause: "Notwithstanding ye be sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you."

One must have Christ's love in his heart before going to the sinner or the criminal with the object of inducing him to repent for his wrongful acts and to reform his life. If the sinner or the criminal refuses to give heed to the efforts which were made to help him and which were tendered solely in the spirit of love, and persists in his sin or his crime and deliberately shuts the door of help in the face of Christ's messenger, then, and then only, has the Christian a right to socially ostracise him.

[1] Luke x., 8–11.

Suppose, however, the individual thus socially ostracised subsequently repents, should the ban of social ostracism be still maintained against him?

Christ said: "Take heed to yourselves: If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him."[1]

Forgiveness implies the blotting out of the offence committed, together with all remedies taken to rebuke the sinner. The repentant sinner is entitled to the same treatment as was accorded to the Prodigal Son on his return to his father's house:

"When he was a great way off his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. . . . The father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him . . . bring hither the fatted calf, and kill it; and let us eat and be merry; for this my son was dead, and is alive again."[2]

Fourth: The teaching in schools and colleges, as well as in churches and Sunday-schools, of the Christian doctrine, that man is of more importance than wealth, that human life is the most valuable asset in society and in the "Kingdom of God," and that he who individually, or through the agency of another, injures, degrades, maims, or destroys life, is a public enemy and an anti-Christian.

[1] Luke xvii., 3. [2] Luke xv., 20–24.

A quaint old cobbler residing in a Western town uses a business card on which he states: "My business is serving the Lord. I mend shoes to pay expenses."

If manufacturers, captains of industry, and business men in general would live up to the principle expressed on the cobbler's card, the evils in business life would speedily disappear, the problem of poverty would be on a high road to a solution, and the social, economic, and industrial world would be so transformed, that men could readily discern the coming of the "Kingdom of God" here on earth.

LABOUR

LABOUR

ABOUT one hundred and twenty-five years ago, political economy, as a separate branch of knowledge, came into existence. It defined the laws which regulate the production, distribution, and exchange of wealth, and made the claim that such laws, and they alone, constitute the whole of the science.

John Stuart Mill, the leading writer on political economy of the nineteenth century, summed up the teachings of this science when he stated that

"political economy is concerned with man solely as a being who desires to possess wealth, and who is capable of judging of the comparative efficacy of means to that end. It makes entire abstraction of every other human passion or motive, except those which may be regarded as perpetually antagonising principles to the desire of wealth; namely, aversion to labour, and desire of the present enjoyment of costly indulgences. . . . Political economy considers mankind as occupied solely in acquiring and consuming wealth."[1]

The teaching of this school was, that the methods by which an individual conducts his business and regulates his general business inter-

[1] *Essays on Some Unpublished Questions*, 1844.

course with his fellows, should be based on the principle contained in the Quaker's advice to his son, "Make money honestly if you can, but make money."

Selfishness was the keynote and materialistic gain the sole object of the science of political economy. "Will it pay?" was the test applied to every condition and to every situation. This teaching, that the acquisition of wealth is the *summum bonum* of life, has been one of the main forces which has created the gulf of separation between the employer and the employee, and has been responsible, to a large extent, for the industrial wars of the past and of the present day.

During the last few years, however, a revolt has arisen against this narrow, selfish, materialistic, "God-forgetting profit-and-loss philosophy,"[1] and a new school of political economy has come into existence.

For the keystone of the arch of the new science, this school has substituted the question, "Is it right?" for the former query, "Will it pay?" This change of viewpoint is due to the recognition of the human element which enters into the production of all commodities.

Dr. Carroll D. Wright, with prophetic vision, has written:

"From these premises I predict that political

[1] Carlyle, *Past and Present*, iii., Chap. 10.

economy will, in the near future, deal largely with the family, with wealth, with the state, as the three features of its doctrines, and not confine itself to wealth alone. Under family, it will take cognisance of the relation of the sexes, marriage and divorce, the position of woman, and the education and employment of children; the last forming the most vital element in the economic consideration of the scientists, as well as inviting the ardent sympathies of the philanthropists. Under wealth, the old chapters will be revivified in the light of moral discernment, relative to all the delicate, but always reciprocal, relations of labour and capital. Under state, political ethics will be taught as a direct means of securing the highest material and social prosperity.

"These considerations in the future will be demanded to answer the questions constantly put, how labour may be rendered more generally attractive and remunerative, without impairing the efficiency of capital, so that all the workers of society may have their proper share in the distribution of profits. This I conceive to be the true labour question of to-day."[1]

Instead of the chief consideration of political economy being the amount of material gains arising out of the production and distribution of economic goods, "the starting point as well as the object point of this new science is man."

For the basis of the new science this school

[1] *Some Ethical Phases of the Labour Question*, pp. 38, 39.

has placed the teachings of Christ, which regulate the relative importance of wealth and of manhood, and the relation which should exist between man and man in every department of human life and activity.

"My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,"[1] said Christ. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth"[2]; and since "the heaven and the earth were finished," God has kept His hand on the machinery of the universe, so that the spheres unfalteringly move in their appointed channels, the earth periodically brings forth its fruits, flowers, and herbs for the good of mankind, the animals, birds, and fish faithfully reproduce their kind, man unceasingly multiplies and develops, and the social forces invariably tend toward the inauguration on earth of the "kingdom" of the Christ.

This world is a huge workshop and every man born into it was created to work. It is a law of life that man must work. If a man does not work he retrogrades, he deteriorates. Through regular, systematic, and persistent work, a man fulfils the purpose of his being; and as he meets and satisfies the requirements of his nature he develops into a higher type of manhood and enjoys the blessings of peace and happiness.

In the parable of the Talents[3] Christ illustrates the duty, the effect, and the reward of work.

[1] John v., 17. [2] Gen. i., 1. [3] Matt. xxv., 14–30.

All our talents, whether they be physical power, mental strength, moral insight, or special aptitude, come from God. They are merely loaned to us. We do not buy them, or earn them, or grow them; they are inherent in us, and for their use we are accountable to the Almighty.

The man with the five talents "straightway . . . went and traded with them . . . and made other five talents." He "straightway," without delay, without postponement, "traded with them," that is, used them; and by using them he doubled their power and their capacity, and thus he became twice the man.

His reward was threefold:

(1) "His Lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant." He received praise for his faithfulness, but not for his success, or for the amount which he had gained. Success depends somewhat on chance, on circumstance, on situations, and not solely on the individual. Faithfulness is personal, and is independent of time, conditions, or other men. Whether successful or not in trade, it is faithfulness to one's task which alone is considered by God.

(2) "I will make thee ruler over many things." By faithfully using his talents, he had become able, experienced, and competent. The captains of industry and the employers of labour are continually searching for faithful, growing men, and faith-

ful, growing men are ever climbing upward on the ladder of success.

(3) "Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." Great is the joy of accomplishment, the knowledge of possessing power to do great things. The successful accomplishment of tasks lifts one up onto a plane with those capable of accomplishing similar work, and the more one's talents develop and multiply, the more one is brought into fellowship with the strong men of earth.

"He also that had received two talents . . . gained two other talents."

The two-talent man had been as faithful in the use of his talents as had been the man of five talents, and, therefore, Christ declared that his reward was the same as that received by the man of five talents.

The number of talents with which an individual was initially endowed did not enter into the value of the reward bestowed. It was faithfulness in the use of one's talents which alone was considered.

The man of one talent, instead of using his talent in the way the five-talent and the two-talent men had used their talents, went and hid his talent in the earth. For his non-use and, therefore, misuse of his talent, Christ pronounced this judgment on him: "Take therefore the talent from him."

The talent which had been loaned to him and

had remained unused, thereby conferring no blessing on him or on mankind, was taken from him. This is the law of life in the physical, mental, moral, and spiritual world. Unused limbs become weak; the inactive mind loses its power; the turning of a deaf ear to the voice of conscience lessens the capacity to hear that small voice.

Charles Darwin, in his autobiography, says that in early life he had a decided taste for poetry and music, but by neglect to cultivate these arts his esthetic tastes grew atrophied, so that during his latter days he found no pleasure in reading a masterpiece of poetry or in listening to an immortal symphony.

The non-use of their talents by a large number of our citizens has created a problem so fraught with danger to the welfare of our nation that all patriotic Americans, whether Christian or not, should awaken to the necessity of dealing with this subject promptly, intelligently, and effectively.

Idlers, whether rich or poor, are menacing dangers. If rich, the idler unsettles the minds of workers; and as idleness breeds extravagant tastes and creates a desire for unwholesome pursuits, his luxurious manner of living awakens envy, creates hatred, and lowers the general tone of society. Men cannot be idle with safety to themselves nor to the community in which they live.

If poor, the idlers may be divided into three general classes: (1) the employable; (2) the unemployable; (3) the vagrant, the incorrigible, and the vicious.

(1) *The Employable.*—The employable, those who are out of work through no fault of their own, but because of hard times, seasonable work, or the over supply of the labour market, need, first of all, assistance in order to obtain work. During enforced idleness, a man naturally broods over his condition, and as a result his mind becomes weakened through discouragement and clouded with discontent, thus causing him to gain a distorted view of life, which often leads to his enlistment in the ranks of those who follow vagaries inconsistent with American democratic institutions and the Christian life.

In order to cope with these constantly recurring conditions, bureaus should be established and conducted by private committees, where complete records of labour conditions in the community and in the surrounding cities and villages would be kept, and where employment is secured for the man willing to work.

(2) *The Unemployable.*—Under this head may be grouped those who are without knowledge of a trade, and those who are physically or mentally incapacitated from securing and retaining employment. So-called "Labour Colonies," similar to those of Germany and Switzerland, where

board may be obtained in exchange for services, and a system of co-operative vacant-lot gardening, where idle men and women may be put to work at cultivating the waste places, under competent instructors, with financial help in the furnishing of seeds, garden implements, etc., should be established in every industrial centre, by municipal bodies or by private societies. Health, skill, self-help, self-confidence, and independence are the results gained by workers from such enterprises.

(3) *Vagrants, Incorrigibles, and the Vicious.*— The imprisonment of this class of idlers has had no reformatory effect whatever upon them, but, in many cases, has been the means of confirming them in their unsocial way of living. The establishment of state or county farms to which such men and women may be sent and where they will be compelled to labour for a time, would be a sane treatment and a proper remedy as viewed by the light of Christ's teachings.

"I must be about my Father's business,"[1] said Christ. For about sixteen years Christ worked as a carpenter doing his "Father's business." His "Father's business" consisted of doing work honestly, earnestly, and wholeheartedly. To fill life-preservers with lead, to adulterate medicine, to can tainted meat or decayed vegetables, to construct buildings carelessly or improperly, or to manufacture articles out of imperfect ma-

[1] Luke ii., 49.

terials, whereby human life may be endangered, is not being about our "Father's business." Nor are we about our "Father's business" when we waste the time for which we are paid for devoting to work, or when we do work which will barely pass inspection.

Whether employed on the street, in the mines, in the office, shop, store, or manufactory, one may work in such a way as to be about the "Father's business." Hugh Black has truly said: "Spiritually it makes little difference what our work is: it is the manner of our doing it. A scavenger may be a truer public servant than a cabinet minister."[1]

This truth is beautifully illustrated by Murillo's famous picture which hangs in the Louvre in Paris. It depicts the interior of a convent kitchen, with angels doing the ordinary kitchen work. Cheerfully, painstakingly, and wholeheartedly one is putting a kettle on the fire, another is cooking, and others are washing dishes.

In this complex civilisation of ours, there is required to be done much necessary work which has the tendency to degrade human beings and which is inimical to their health and development. No conceivable industrial system will eliminate all such work, but many changes can be made which will greatly reduce the perils and the evil influences surrounding such work.

[1] *Work*, p. 79.

"But, furthermore [writes Rev. Alfred Wesley Wishart], something can be done with the individual, for after all that we can do to improve conditions, he still needs something more. The drain man in *The Servant in the House* was a noble character in spite of his work. Drain work must be done by somebody. The task of purifying the physical conditions of a building may cost a man his life, but the right sort of a man does not hesitate. He glories in the opportunity to do a real man's work. The trouble with us all is that we have placed a stigma on many kinds of work that call for the noblest heroism. We honour the man who dies on the battle-field, often for an unjust cause, and pay no heed to those who die for us performing the disagreeable tasks of society. Necessary, unpleasant work in many cases will be robbed of the power to degrade, when we see it in its true perspective, and honour the heroes who do the work."[1]

Work which has no other end than the mere making of money becomes a petty drudgery and causes life to be exceedingly dull.

While work enlarges, develops, and dignifies the powers of man, man should dignify, ennoble, and glorify work, through the motive which inspires his work, the spirit in which he works, and the end for which he works.

The motive which should inspire work is full and complete self-development; the spirit which

[1] *Proceedings of N. Y. State Conference of Religion*, series viii., No. 3, p. 52.

should direct work is love for mankind; the end for which work should be done, is the establishment of the "Kingdom of God" here on earth.

It is not alone when dealing with large issues, imposing duties, and heroic enterprises, that we are called upon to do our best and most faithful work, but it is also when doing the small and seemingly insignificant tasks. Christ said that "he that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much."

The lives of human beings are so closely interlinked that every work done, whether great or small, has an influence for good or evil on the life of some one.

In order to raise work to a place of dignity, the fact that all work affects others should be recognised, and the spirit of working for the good of others should enter into it. The careless weaving of a piece of rope, or the imperfect moulding of a bar of steel, may be the cause of an injury to a human being or the destruction of a human life. Sham or shoddy work is a wrong against society in that it often becomes a means of inflicting suffering on the innocent.

This fact is rapidly dissipating the remnants of that one-time accepted idea, that it is of little consequence how a man conducts his business during the week provided he strictly observes all the rules and regulations of the Christian Church for the observance of Sunday. To-day,

the truth that no man by religious devotions can nullify the evil effects of dishonest work in his shop or counting-room, is beginning to be realised.

If a man foresees in his work the use to which it will be put in the service of others, and sees with his mind's eye the furnished product on its journey bringing weal or woe to its future user, he will find joy in doing his work so that it may prove of value to mankind.

The unchristian spirit abroad in the world to-day is manifested in the adulterations and the shams and shoddy work seen everywhere, necessitating the enactment of pure-food, meat-inspection, and tenement-house laws.

President Woodrow Wilson in his baccalaureate sermon to the graduating class of Princeton College, June 13, 1909, said: "You know what the usual standard of the employee is in our day. It is to give as little as he may for his wages."

If a man truly loves his brother, he will find joy in doing his best work for his brother; for love can be shown in no better way than by service; and in serving his brother he is about the "Father's business."

"Properly speaking [says Carlyle], all true work is religion; and whatsoever religion is not work may go and dwell among the Brahmins, Antinomians, Spinning Dervishes, or where it will; with me it shall have no harbour. Admirable is that saying of the old monks, *Laborare est orare*—work is worship."

Whether the task be great or small, it is the spirit and the faithfulness with which the work is performed that counts, for all "service ranks the same with God."

If diligent, painstaking, conscientious work is required of a Christian, then is the demand of the working men for an eight-hour work-day unchristian?

Man has a threefold nature, physical, mental, and spiritual, each of which demands use in order that development instead of atrophy may result. The number of hours to be devoted daily to the well-being of the physical, mental, and spiritual in man, should be in proportion to the requirements of each. That one attribute of man's nature should not be developed at the expense of another is manifest in the operation of the laws of life and in Christ's parable of the Talents.

The minute division of labour in American industries in this twentieth century allows but little chance for the full development of man's mind and spirit. To work for ten, twelve, or more hours a day at a task which is largely automatic and benumbing, or at a work which is physically and mentally exhausting, leaves a man, when his day's labour is over, with neither time nor strength for the development of his intellectual and spiritual nature.

The number of hours an individual should devote to work in order to earn sufficient for the

support of himself and his family, depends on the kind of labour in which he is engaged.

It has been determined that eight hours of work a day in our manufacturing and mining industries is about all that a human being can endure, if he is to be left in a condition to develop the higher side of his nature after his day's toil.

A short work day would give a man more time to enjoy life, and such leisure would tend to develop in him a love for home and family life, would broaden his intellectual, social, and political interests, and thus would increase his needs and requirements.

The fact that some men may misuse such opportunity for their educational and spiritual (viz.: ethical, esthetic, and religious) culture, is no excuse for withholding the privilege from them.

If it is the duty of a Christian to use all his talents and develop all his powers, it is also his duty, in so far as he is able, to give every human being a like opportunity to use and develop his talents and powers.

If eight hours a day is the maximum of time which a man should devote to manual labour, then it is the duty of Christians to join hands with and to assist all who are endeavouring to secure legislation which would limit the employment of men in such labour to eight hours a day.

The effect of a short working day is described by Mr. John Mitchell as follows:

"You would be surprised to note the progress the coal-miners are making since the inauguration of the eight-hour day three years ago. In many places they are organising libraries, they are taking a real interest in public questions, and their family life has become much improved and sweetened. . . . The eight-hour day is the greatest temperance advocate I know of."[1]

Not only should the working hours of men be limited to eight hours a day, but the working hours of children should be carefully regulated.

It is the common judgment of both Europe and America that no child under fourteen years of age should be employed for gain, in stores, factories, and mines. It is virtually agreed in this country that there should be legal regulation for children between fourteen and sixteen years of age, such regulation to include the prohibition of night work, the shortening of the daily hours of labour, the protection against dangerous machinery, and unsanitary and immoral conditions.

Owen R. Lovejoy writes:

"Our fourfold duty, therefore, seems clear: (1) To exclude all young children and all undeveloped children from the burdens of wage-earning industries. (2) To forbid the employment of all children and youth in industries which menace life, health, or morals. (3) To limit the hours, forbid the

[1] Quoted from *Gospel of the Kingdom*, Sept., 1909, p. 92.

night employment, and otherwise guard the conditions of those children and youth who may be employed; and (4) to aid in those constructive measures which aim to revise the curriculum and equip the facilities of the public schools to meet the recognised needs of an industrial civilisation."[1]

There are many men in our country who employ young children at work which tends to stunt their growth, endanger their health, deaden their mind, and weaken their morals, and who, notwithstanding, escape public condemnation. Let these facts become known, and we may be assured that the Herods who murder children by working them during the tender years of their life for long hours, at nerve-racking tasks, amid unwholesome conditions, and at night shifts, will not escape public execration.

One of the most important problems awaiting solution is, what constitutes the proper and just division of the profits of industry between the man who buys and the man who sells labour. It is generally admitted that this division of profit should accomplish two things—first, the employer should receive a fair return on his invested capital; and, second, the employee should receive at least a living wage.

Wages paid unskilled workers are governed, to a large extent, by the law of demand and supply.

[1] *National Child Labour Committee, Pamphlet No. 108*, p. 14.

At the present time, that law has fixed the wages of unskilled day labourers at so low a sum, that the average annual income of the worker is insufficient for the decent support of himself and his normally sized family. The establishment of this low wage is due to the arrival annually of large numbers of immigrants who, in most cases, are without knowledge of a trade or ability to speak the English language, and consequently are willing to work for a wage approximating the meagre income they were accustomed to receive in the Old World.

To remedy the condition of the day labourer who has lived in the United States long enough to have adopted our customs and habits of living, and whose daily wage has become insufficient to provide his family with proper shelter, food, and clothing, and to prevent his sons from remaining in the same industrial level, vocational training is absolutely essential.

To obtain an increase in wages, a man must do more efficient work. Unless he becomes so efficient as to lift himself above the doing of common unskilled labour, he will receive no increase in his pay. Improvement in the productive capacity of a man is the only way by which he can earn more wages and be entitled to higher pay.

Prof. J. Lawrence Laughlin has clearly explained this fact in these words:

"Increased efficiency is to a labourer what increased utility is to a commodity. But while supply is in the long run dominant even over utility, the effect of increased efficiency, as human beings go, works in practice not only to increase his utility to his employer, but also to place him where the supply of his kind of labour is less. Higher wages are, therefore, in the natural course of events, almost inevitable, when efficiency is improved."[1]

Vocational training is the only hope of advancement for the untrained labourer. Schools providing such training is the crying need of the day. If the sons of the immigrants are to be capable of doing a higher class of work than their fathers did, they must receive special industrial training.

The establishing of public schools for vocational training is the duty of every municipality. As Christ gave the bedridden man the strength to rise up and carry his own bed, so every Christian should aim to give every boy and man an opportunity to become industrially efficient so that he may be able to bear his own burdens and to care for those dependent upon him.

The principle of association, co-operation, and combination, which has been developing in the social, political, and industrial world since man first realised the necessity of self-protection and

[1] *Latter-Day Problems*, p. 76.

self-preservation, has now become the most vital factor in social life.

That Christ recognised the value of association and of co-operation in work, is evidenced by His gathering of the twelve disciples about Him, and of combining their several qualities and unifying their individual efforts into one definite line of endeavour. Christ distinctly set His seal of approval on combinations, both of men and of property.

During the last twenty years, American capitalists have been combining, and to-day the consolidation of forces is the steady, growing movement among the employer class.

"Mr. Moody, in his *Truth about the Trusts*, gives the following figures for January 1, 1908: The seven greater industrial trusts—that is, the Amalgamated Copper Co., the American Smelting & Refining Co., the American Sugar Refining Co., the American Tobacco Co., International Merchant Marine Co., the Standard Oil Co., and the U. S. Steel Corporation, with their various and numerous affiliations, own or control 1638 plants, with a total of $2,708,438,754 capitalisation, in stocks and bonds outstanding. The lesser industrial trusts own or control 5038 plants, with a total capitalisation of $8,243,175,000, making a grand total of 6676 plants and $10,951,613,754 of capitalisation. The franchise trusts, *e.g.* street-car lines, own or control 2599 plants with $7,789,393,000 capitalisation; the great steam

railroad groups own or control 745 plants with a capitalisation of $12,931,154,000. The grand total of all these trusts for plants is 10,020 and for capitalisation $31,672,160,754 in stocks and bonds outstanding."[1]

On October 30, 1903, "The Citizens Industrial Association of America" was organised. This is an association of manufacturers organised for the purpose of opposing what they claim to be the exactions of the labour unions. This association boasts of a membership of three thousand manufacturers, each of whom contributes fifty dollars a year toward the creation of a fund for use in industrial battles.

Since 1900, the progress of the movement for the organisation of employers of labour into strong associations, with the primary purpose of treating with, or of resisting the claims of, labour unions, has been so rapid that at the present time nearly every important feature of trade-union organisation has its counterpart in some employers' association.

On the other hand, labour unions are being organised, federations of unions are being formed, and the labourer's dream that the working men of America will be united in one confederated body is rapidly becoming a reality. A federation that for five months can stop the mining of anthracite coal, is a power far greater than the founders of

[1] *Gospel of the Kingdom*, December, 1908, p. 22.

the American Commonwealth were capable of picturing. One federation is composed of more than twenty thousand unions, and these unions cover every trade. It is estimated that the combined membership of labour unions in the United States is nearly 3,000,000. Not only are the trade-unions strong in number, but their financial strength is also great. On January 1, 1903, the United Mine Workers had in their treasury $1,027,120.29. They gave for the relief of the anthracite coal strikers, in 1902, $258,343.93, and raised by assessments $1,967,026.34, making a total of $2,225,370.28 raised for the relief of the anthracite coal strikers by the United Mine Workers of this country.

The aim of the working men in so uniting is to obtain shorter hours of labour, better conditions under which to work, and an increase in their wages. Their leaders are retained in office only so long as they are able to pluck the golden fruit from the tree of capital. "Get more for us in shortness of hours and increase of wage," are the daily commands of the working men to their leaders.

At the present time, our country is facing two camps, drawn up in line of battle, each on the look-out for a sign of disagreement which may furnish an excuse for an industrial war. This situation constitutes a live vital social and economic problem which demands an immediate and Christian solution.

The solution of the "labour problem" in all its phases will be found ultimately in the substitution of Christ's Golden Rule, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," for the David Harum golden rule, "Do unto the other fellow the way he 'd like to do unto you, an' do it fust," which is to-day the guiding policy of most employers and employees. But the millennium is not yet in sight; it is still a long way off. Christ recognised this fact when He provided a provisional plan for the settlement of controversies.

"Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother.

"But if he will not hear thee, then take thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.

"And if he shall neglect to hear thee, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."[1]

Christ's solution of controversies requires, in the first instance, an attempt at reconciliation through personal mediation.

Applying Christ's remedy to industrial disputes, the employer on the one hand and the labour union on the other, before adopting strike or

[1] Matt. xviii., 15–17.

lock-out measures, should endeavour to reach an amicable settlement through conference.

While questions as to the amount and time of payment of wages, hours of labor, working arrangements, and the recognition of trade-unions, have been the cause of many industrial disturbances, one of the chief causes of labour troubles, which widens the breach between the employer and his employees, is their lack of appreciating each other's view and their neglect to study each other's interests, to the end that each may contribute to their common welfare and to the success of the industry with which they are associated. If the employer and his employees, or committees representing their true interests, were to sit around the same table and listen to each other's arguments, and endeavour to get each other's viewpoint and to understand each other's reasons, learning to give as well as to take, holding vital opinions steadfastly but expressing them moderately, keeping the mind open to conviction, and desiring to come to a sound and fair conclusion, the result would be the promotion of mutual good feeling, confidence, and sympathy; the removal of misunderstandings; the lessening of the power of unscrupulous labour leaders; and, on coming to know each other better, suspicions would fade away, and the employer and employee would learn to respect and trust each other.

Fundamentally, there is no hostility between

capital and labour; neither can exist long without the other; the interest of the one is the interest of the other, and on the prosperity of the one depends the prosperity of the other. Both the employer and the employee are deeply interested in the establishment of a living wage: the employer, that his business may not be endangered by strikes; and the employee, that he may secure a high standard of living. So long as working men earn less than what they consider to be necessary for decent existence, they are liable to inaugurate strikes. On the other hand, were living wages paid, and labour unions represented by intelligent, honest, and loyal leaders, there would be but little likelihood of strikes.

No truer statement has been made than the following from the pen of Hon. Jonathan Ross:

"Capital and labour are interdependent. Neither can be prosperous and in a healthy condition without the other is equally so. Neither can be in good demand unless the other is also. They should be friends and work harmoniously together. Otherwise both are injured, the public incommoded, and the prosperity and commerce of the nation imperilled. Hostility and warfare between these classes is destructive of the true interests of both and of the highest welfare of the public, as destructive and as much out of place as they would be between husband

and wife, if they would maintain a happy, prosperous home and household."[1]

If the parties to the dispute fail to come to an agreement in settlement, then Christ's advice is that they should appoint arbitrators to decide the controversy.

If each party to a controversy believes his position is a just and fair one, then neither should object to having the matter in difference presented to a disinterested party or parties for the purpose of determining the merits of the case and for making the award.

Dr. Carroll D. Wright, in his lecture, "How Battles of Labour are Treated," said:

"The work of the Anthracite Board of Conciliation is significant not only in itself, but in its results. From its organisation, in June, 1903, up to August, 1905, one hundred and forty-one cases were submitted to it for arbitration. Ten were complaints by the mine owners and one hundred and thirty-one by the mine workers. Of the total number of complaints submitted, forty-six were withdrawn and twenty-eight were not sustained, making seventy-four complaints which had not sufficient basis to warrant their presentation to the Board. Of the remainder, nineteen complaints were sustained, three were partly sustained, eleven mutually settled, three compromised, and thirty-one were left pending. Seventeen cases

[1] "Labour's Warfare and Capital," *American Industries*, April 1, 1904.

were sent to an umpire, the board being evenly divided on them. Most of these cases were decided against the miners, but the decision in all cases, whether against the miners or against the operators, was accepted as final, and no break in the work of the miners occurred. There was hardly one case disposed of, by the Board or by the umpire, which under other conditions would not have precipitated a strike."

If the award of the arbitrators is not accepted by the parties in dispute, Christ's advice as to the next step to be taken is to bring the matter before the court.[1]

At the present time neither the United States nor any of the individual States have provided a court for the hearing of labour controversies and for the settling of questions in dispute between employers and employees. In the United States to-day, strikes and lock-outs, with their attendant evils, are the only methods existing whereby the parties in difference can settle their disputes when they have failed to reach an amicable settlement.

An industrial court, organised under the judicial system of each State, should be established for the determining of controversies between employers and employees in the same manner as

[1] *Christianity and the Social Problems*, by Lyman Abbott, pp. 241, 283.

our courts of law determine controversies between individuals.[1]

Finally, if the disputing parties are not satisfied with the decision of the industrial court, Christ commanded that they should separate and have no further dealings or connection with each other. This command of Christ puts a ban on the boycott and the unfair list.

By the adoption of Christ's solution—conciliation, mediation, arbitration, industrial court, and the "let alone" policy—the rights of capital and labour would be protected, the breach between the industrial classes would be bridged, and the spirit of "peace on earth, good-will to men," would appear above the horizon of our disturbed and disquieting industrial life.

[1] For an outline of the constitution of an American industrial court, see *Vital American Problems*.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE

AT the time of Christ, the original purpose of and the ordained manner of observing the Jewish Sabbath—the day set apart by Jehovah as a recurring period of rest for His children on earth—had become generally misunderstood. Christ, by word and by example, endeavoured to revive the true meaning of the day and to restore its observance to accord with its original purpose. He swept aside all the forms, rubrics, rules, and customs which had grown up so thickly about the observance of the day as to hide its true import, and in revealing its real significance He was supposed to be destroying the distinctiveness of the day and to be abrogating the Sabbath altogether.

As observed by the Jews, the Sabbath was a day in which there was entire cessation from work, even though the work might be of the nature of social service. It had become a festival entirely negative in character, and its observance had become so hedged about with "thou shalt not" rules, that the natural activities of man on that day were narrowed, restricted, and hampered, in every possible way. Instead of the Sabbath proving a divine benefit to man, it had become, through the teachings of the rabbis, a day of revolting bondage.

No more heed was given to Christ's teachings on Sabbath observance than was paid to His invitation to the Hebrew race to become citizens of the "Kingdom of heaven"; and when He died on the cross the old Hebrew dispensation, with its laws, rules, and customs, applicable solely to that people, came to an end, and, on the first day of the week, when He arose from the dead, the new era of Christianity was born.

It is a significant fact that during the forty days which intervened between Christ's resurrection and His ascension, He made five appearances to His disciples, each appearance being on the first day of the week. It is also significant that on each occasion He found the disciples gathered together on that day.[1]

In the Acts of the Apostles and in the writings of the Church Fathers the fact is recorded that, after Christ's ascension, the early Christians regularly assembled on the first day of the week to celebrate the anniversary of the day on which the Saviour rose from the dead and on which He subsequently appeared unto them to give His final instructions before departing for His heavenly home.

The peculiar designation, the "Lord's day," as applied to the first day of the week, is indicative of the purpose of the early Christians to consecrate that day as a memorial to their Master, instead

[1] Mark xvi., 9, 10; Matt. xxviii., 8–10; Mark xvi., 12; Luke xxiv., 34; Luke xxiv., 36–43.

of retaining the Jewish Sabbath, the seventh day of the week, for their formal weekly day of rejoicing over the resurrection of Christ from the tomb.

Though there is nothing on record to show that Christ set apart the first day of the week as a time for special spiritual enrichment and soul culture, yet the substitution of the first day of the week for the Jewish Sabbath must have had apostolic sanction and approval, else it would not have become the settled, undisputed custom of the early Christians, and have been adopted, without question or criticism, throughout Christendom during the centuries which have rolled by since Christ ascended into heaven.

A new day having arisen out of the ashes of the old Hebrew Sabbath and been dedicated as a special season to commemorate the risen Lord, what were Christ's teachings as to how the day should be observed?

During His earthly ministry, Christ engaged in many controversies with the Jews concerning Sabbath observance, wherein He laid down the following two principles, which radically differed from those in force in Judea at that time:

First: That it is right to do such work on the Sabbath as is necessary to sustain and upbuild life.

It was on the Sabbath that Christ and His disciples "plucked the ears of corn, and did eat, rub-

bing them in their hands," which act on the Sabbath was contrary to the Jewish law, and in reply to criticism Christ said: "Have ye not read so much as this, what David did, when himself was an hungered, and they which were with him; how he went into the house of God, and did take and eat the shewbread, and gave also to them that were with him; which it is not lawful to eat but for the priests alone?"[1]

Second: That it is right to do such work on the Sabbath as will bring benefit to others.

He restored the withered hand,[2] declaring: "It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days"; He cured the paralytic woman,[3] saying: "Doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?"; He healed the man suffering from the dropsy,[4] and justified his act by asking: "Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the Sabbath day?"; He told the man at the pool of Bethesda, who had "an infirmity thirty and eight years," "Rise, take up thy bed, and walk," and gave as His only excuse for curing the invalid and directing that he violate the Jewish law,

[1] Luke vi., 1–4; Matt. xii., 1–6.
[2] Matt. xii., 10–13.
[3] Luke xiii., 11–17.
[4] Luke xiv., 1–6.

"Thou shalt bear no burden on the Sabbath day," this statement: "My Father worketh even until now and I work."[1]

Christ declared "The Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath,"[2] and that "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath."[3]

From these words it is clearly evident that Christ did not intend that man should make of Sunday a day of self-denial of all that enlarges and beautifies life, nor a day of absolute abstinence from work or pleasure, but that he should make of it a day for the resting, the strengthening, and the recuperating of the whole man—physical, mental, and spiritual.

Sunday, the "Lord's day," was set apart as a sanctuary for weary, heavy-laden men and women, a breathing space from ceaseless toil.

Sunday is needed as a "rest-day." It is imperative that one day in seven be devoted to rest for both body and mind. The machinery of the human being requires periodically recurrent times of rest in order that it may be able to do its appointed work. As the body requires a certain part of each day to be devoted to sleep, so the body requires one day of each week to be consecrated to rest.

Dr. John Richard Farre of London in his testi-

[1] John v., 2–17. [2] Matt. xii., 8; Luke vi., 5.
[3] Mark ii., 27.

mony before a committee of the British Parliament, said:

"The ordinary exertions of man run down the circulation every day of his life, and the first law of nature, by which God (who is not only the giver, but is also the preserver of life) prevents man from destroying himself, is the alternating of day and night, that repose may succeed action. But although the night apparently equalises the circulation well, yet it does not sufficiently restore its balance for the attainment of a long life. Hence, one day in seven, by the bounty of Providence, is thrown in as a day of compensation, to perfect by its repose the animal system."[1]

The proper observance of Sunday has been a mooted question largely because physical inaction or cessation from physical labour was considered the only kind of rest a human being required. As man has a spiritual and mental as well as a physical body which needs rest, the observance of the Lord's day should not be limited to the resting of the physical body alone.

Rest is not gained solely from inactivity. Change of scene, change of occupation, and change of thought often furnish the best kind of rest.

Rest consists in not merely letting the wheels run down and quietude take the place of action,

[1] Quoted from *The Sabbath for Man*, by Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, pp. 200, 201.

but it also includes the replenishing of the wasted parts and the oiling of the entire human machinery.

Sunday should be observed in such a way that on Monday morning the individual will start out with harder muscles, stronger nerves, a clearer mind, and a purer heart than he possessed on the previous Saturday night.

In order to be of best service to the individual and to fulfil its true mission, Sunday should be observed in a manner different from all other days. "The Sabbath was made for man," that is, for the development of the highest and best in man.

As man's spiritual nature is of greater importance to his present and future well-being than are his mental and physical natures, the chief duty of the individual should be to keep Sunday in such a way as to elevate and develop his spiritual nature. This he can do by coming into communion with the Almighty in the closet and in the sanctuary, by reading God's Word, and by serving his brothers and sisters in need.

"No man [said Dr. Joseph Parker] who uses the Church as the Church ought to be used can find anywhere an influence that ought to admit of a competitive position for one moment, when the church services are rightly conducted, in their music, in their devotion, in their pulpit instruction; when the revelation of God is treated in all its firmamental breadth and all its solar lustrousness there will be no place, on

all the green earth, so attractive and so grand as the house of God."[1]

The duty second in importance for Sunday observance is the resting and developing of the mind. The reading of trashy stories, the witnessing of immoral or suggestive plays, the directing of thoughts into impure or degrading channels, is making of Sunday a time for the lowering and not for the ennobling of the mind, and such use of the day is, therefore, contrary to the teachings of Christ.

Should novels be read on Sunday? If the reading of a novel rests one's mind, elevates one's thought, and purifies one's outlook on life, then such reading would not be a desecration of the day.

Should libraries and art-galleries be open to the public on Sunday? As libraries contain the wisdom of the ages, the great thoughts uttered by the world's most eminent seers and philosophers, one who comes under their influence cannot fail to receive inspiration, uplift, and strength which will enable him to play well his part in the theatre of life; and, therefore, no reasonable objection can be raised to the sacrificing of the few attendants for the bringing of good to the many. The refining influence of the beauty of line, colour, and design, and the ennobling effect of the heroic ideals which artists have produced on canvas, can-

[1] *Inner Life of Christ*, p. 206.

not be over-estimated in their value on the lives of those who, with open minds and open hearts, view the masterpieces of art.

The sole restriction placed on the Sunday opening of libraries and art-galleries should be, that these institutions be opened only after the close of the morning services in the churches, in order that the highest form of spiritual regeneration may not be sacrificed to a less powerful stimulant for the elevation of mankind.

Should card-playing be indulged in on Sunday? If the mind can secure rest in no other way—that is, in a way by which rest and improvement are combined, then card-playing on Sunday ought not to be condemned.

Should theatre performances be permitted on Sunday? This question has a threefold aspect: first, the effect on the performers; second, the effect on the audience; third, the effect on the community.

First: If the acting of the play tends to rest and upbuild the physical, mental, and spiritual natures of the actor, then acting is not an objectionable use of the day.

Second: If the effect of the play on the audience is to enlarge the horizon, to elevate the ideal, and to purify the mind, then the witnessing of the play on Sunday is not antagonistic to Christ's teachings on the observance of the day.

Third: If the play has a refining and ennobling

effect on the community, then the question becomes a personal one with the actor: Could I make better use of the day than by presenting upon the stage pictures which will stimulate the audience to lead nobler and purer lives?

The third human element is the physical, which is of less importance than the spiritual and the mental. As, however, the spiritual and mental qualities depend largely for their growth and development upon the health and strength of the physical body, the physical well-being of the individual should be given careful consideration.

Is it an unchristian act to play base-ball, golf, or tennis, to dance, or to indulge in automobile or carriage rides on Sunday? To take exercise which rests, strengthens, and develops the physical body, and which at the same time has no injurious effect on the spiritual and mental being, is in keeping with Christ's teachings on the observance of Sunday.

The purpose of Sunday being for the upbuilding of the whole man, the day should be so used that the spiritual, mental, and physical natures may receive rest, strength, and development.

The amount and kind of rest the individual should take on Sunday should be determined by the temperament of the man, his physical condition, the kind of work in which he is engaged during the week, and the conditions under which the work is performed.

The relative importance of man's threefold nature should be kept clearly in mind, in order that the lower may not be developed at the expense of the higher. The development of the spiritual being should have the foremost place in one's thoughts and the larger portion of the day devoted to its cultivation. Mental improvement should be placed second only to the spiritual, and the physical should receive the least consideration.

Shall one do work on Sunday? If by the sacrifice of self others may enjoy benefits otherwise unobtainable, then Sunday work is Christian. Christ sat at meat on the Sabbath day in the house of one of the Pharisees, and servants waited on Him; and He rebuked them not. No higher or better use can be made of the Lord's day than to dedicate it to the service of humanity. Nothing so rests, strengthens, and ennobles an individual as self-sacrificing service for the good of mankind. By consecrating Sunday as a day for forgetting self in the doing of good to others, a man will receive all the benefits the day was intended to give to him.

On Monday morning the individual can determine whether he observed the preceding Sunday as he should have done. If his body is wasted by dissipation, if his energies are exhausted from frivolous games or from gross amusements, if his tone of life is lowered from mere animalism, then he misused the "Lord's day."

Finally, the individual has no right to indulge in any act, however intrinsically innocent or harmless it may appear to him, if by such act he will influence others to their injury. The conduct to be observed on Sunday should be based on two considerations: first, will it influence others for good, and, second, will it develop the best within?

INTERNATIONAL CONTROVERSIES

INTERNATIONAL CONTROVERSIES

CHRIST'S mission on earth was of a twofold character: first, to reveal man's relation to God and his relation to other men; and, second, to teach the obligations and duties arising out of such relationship.

Christ declared that God is the Father of all, and that such Fatherhood of God necessarily created the brotherhood of man. The obligations of this sonship were summed up by Christ in these words: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength"; and the obligation of brotherhood, in this statement: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."[1]

Love for one's neighbour is the essence of Christ's message regarding our dealings with one another. If the right attitude of a Christian toward his neighbour is love, then the attitude of a group of Christians toward other groups of men should be love. This is so, because a nation is an "aggregation of persons,"[2] or as Prof. Cooley says: "Nation is nearly synonymous with people, and in the United States it is applied to the whole

[1] Mark xii., 28–31. [2] *Century Dictionary.*

body of the people coming under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government,"[1] and therefore the duties and obligations resting on a nation are identical with those resting on the individuals constituting the nation.

The recognition of the brotherhood of man should be the basis of international intercourse and international dealings. Though men live on opposite shores of the ocean, and possess different coloured skins and speak different languages, and observe different customs, and give their fealty to different flags, they are nevertheless brothers and should treat each other as brothers. Neither class, nor race, nor national boundaries can sever the bond of brotherhood or release the obligation of neighbourliness as is clearly affirmed in the parable of the man who fell among thieves on the road to Jericho.[2] Universal brotherhood entailing universal love, as the basic conception of the relation of man to man, was absolute and unchangeable in the teachings of the Master. If a Christian loves his brother, how can he run him through with a bayonet, or pick him off with a rifle, or blow him to pieces with a shell, or send him to the bottom of the sea with a torpedo?

The law of Christ is, love and forgive your enemy; the law of war is, hate and destroy your enemy. James Russell Lowell has written:

[1] "Const. Limit.," 5th ed. *Prin. Const. Law*, p. 20.
[2] Luke x., 29–37.

"Ez fer war, I call it murder,
There you hev it plain and flat.
I don't need to go no furder
Than my Testyment fer that."

To-day, the most costly and deadly armaments for the killing of men in war are being wrought, not by the nations that owe their allegiance to Mahomet, the prophet of the sword, but by those nations which profess allegiance to the Prince of Peace.

Dr. Channing has well said:

"Here is the evil of war that man, made to be the brother, becomes the deadly foe, of his kind; that man, whose duty it is to mitigate suffering, makes the infliction of suffering his study and end; that man, whose office it is to avert and heal the wounds which come from nature's powers, makes researches into nature's laws, and arms himself with her most awful forces, that he may become the destroyer of his race."

Mr. Ernest H. Crosby has written:

"Yes, war is hell, as General Sherman long ago told us; but he did not go on to tell us why. There is only one possible reason. Hell is not a geographical term; it is merely the expression of the spiritual condition of its inhabitants. War is hell because it transforms men into devils. And how naturally the terminology of hell accommodates itself to it! In different columns of a single copy of the New York

Herald, describing, I think, different engagements, I read that the soldiers 'fought like demons,' and 'yelled like fiends.' It is all so natural that probably no one noticed it but myself. And so we found in the case of the burning Spanish ship the word 'inferno' seemed the most appropriate."[1]

In the Sermon on the Mount, Christ declared: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God"[2]; and as His aim was to bring "peace on earth," His disciples should be ambassadors of peace.

The late Lord Russell, former Lord Chief-Justice of England, said that "the ultimate aim in the actions of men and of communities ought to conform to the divine precept—'Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you.'"

"If the so-called Christian nations were nations of Christians there would be no wars," wisely declares Lord Avebury,[3] for where love is enthroned, wars and rumours of war are unknown.

Since all the nations of the present day are not Christian and since those nations calling themselves "Christian" do not always adhere to the teachings of Christ, international controversies are bound to happen, disputes to arise, and conflicts to occur,—arousing the passions, inflaming the imaginations, and inducing the animal spirit in

[1] *War from the Christian Point of View*, p. 5.
[2] Matt. v., 9.
[3] *Peace and Happiness*, p. 383.

man to call for the bloody arbitrament of war. Is there no way of escape from such a darkening, blighting prospect, no method suggested by Christ whereby international differences and controversies may be justly and peaceably settled?

For nineteen hundred years, the teachings of Christ have had no place in the council chambers of the nations. The attitude of the judge in the trial of the young Doukhobor was and now is symbolical of the attitude of the statesmen of the world. On a Doukhobor's refusal to enter the Russian army, he was brought for trial before a judge, who reasoned with him concerning the folly of his course. By way of defence, the Doukhobor responded with a homily upon the teachings of Jesus. "Quite right you are," answered the judge, "from the point of abstract virtue, but the time has not yet come to put into practice the literal sayings of Christ." "The time may not have come for you, your Honour," was the reply, "but the time has come for us."[1]

To His disciples, Christ said:

"If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.

"If he shall neglect to hear thee, tell it unto the

[1] *Newer Ideals of Peace*, by Jane Addams, p. 230.

church; and if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican."[1]

By applying Christ's teachings to groups of individuals, such as nations, a sane, just, and equitable solution of all international controversies will be found.

First: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone."

Whenever an international controversy arises, the aggrieved nation, through its diplomatic agents, should at once enter into negotiations for the securing of a peaceful settlement.

The accustomed method of opening negotiations by the firing of a cannon or by the sinking of a warship is contrary to the teachings of Christ.

If, after exhausting all diplomatic measures, the controversy remains unsettled, Christ indicates the following step to be taken.

Second: "If he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established."

When personal negotiation has proved ineffectual, the aggrieved nation should call friendly sister nations to its aid in order to effect a peaceful settlement.

[1] Matt. xviii., 15–17.

When friendly mediation has proved of no avail, Christ directs:

Third: "If he shall neglect to hear thee, tell it unto the church."

In the days of Christ, the Sanhedrin, the court of the church, was the final court of appeal wherein all controversies, both legal and religious, were settled.

When diplomacy and mediation have failed to bring about a settlement, Christ commands that all international controversies be submitted to a court of the nations.

Fourth: "If he neglects to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican."

If either nation refuses to submit its side of the controversy to a court, or if, after a controversy has been so submitted, it refuses to abide by the court's decision, the aggrieved nation, even in that extremity, has no right to resort to war, but should sever all diplomatic and consular communications with the opposing nation and thenceforth ignore its existence.

The events of the nineteenth century clearly reveal two apparently diverse streams of thought concerning international relations and international disputes. Preparations for war from year to year had finally, at the close of the century, built up the most complete, colossal, and expensive

system of militarism that the world had ever seen; while, during the same period of time, more had been done to prevent war and to secure peace than had been accomplished in the preceding fifteen hundred years.

The dread of the results of war, the fear of being caught unprepared for war, and the belief that preparedness for war is the best security for peace, have caused the nations to annually increase the number of their battleships and the size of their standing army. To-day the governments of the world are bent almost to breaking under the weight of the ever increasing armaments and are rapidly drifting toward bankruptcy in order to uphold their honour should it be assailed, to protect their interests should they be imperilled, and to destroy their neighbours should it be considered expedient.

President Jacob Gould Schurman of Cornell, in speaking before the Second National Peace Congress, May 2, 1909, said:

"The preparations for war in modern times bear with tremendous weight in times of peace upon all classes of the community. The financial load is enough to make the richest nations reel and stagger. As Senator Hale has stated, two-thirds of all the revenue of the United States are used to defray the expenses entailed by past wars or necessary in the preparation for future wars. Taking Europe as a whole, something like 6,000,000 of people are now in

arms, withdrawn from industrial pursuits. Their maintenance is all the time a burden on the productive classes of the community. It is estimated that Europe is regularly expending on her standing armies from $6,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000. And the most powerful European nations are at this moment competing with one another in extravagant expenditures on their armies and navies."

The United States, separated and distant from other nations, and thus in least danger of attack, with a cosmopolitan population, made up of all races and thus linked to all nations by ties of affection, during the ten years prior to 1898, spent on the army and navy, exclusive of pension charges, $507,000,000. For the ten years following 1898, the expenses amounted to $1,626,000,000, or $1,119,000,000 more than in the prior ten years.[1]

The appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1910, for the army, fortifications, and military academy, amounted to $111,897,515.67; for the navy, $136,935,199.05; and for pensions, $160,908,000, or a total appropriation on account of wars and preparations therefor of $409,740,714.42, while the total executive, legislative, and judicial appropriations for the same period of time amounted to only $32,007,049, the former being twelve times as much as the latter.

[1] Address of Hon. David J. Brewer, June 12, 1909, reported in *The Advocate of Peace*, Oct., 1909, p. 207.

During the last one hundred years Europeans have been growing more and more cosmopolitan. The enormous increase of production and commerce has created business relations (international exchanges reaching the enormous sum of $28,000,000,000 a year) which have been binding the people of the various nations closer together; while travel, due to the improved facilities of transportation, the reading of newspapers which convey timely information of every important event that happens throughout the world, and the constant flow and return of millions of emigrants across national lines, are breaking down the barriers of prejudice and national egoism, and are obliterating many of the old misconceptions held by the people of one nation with regard to the people of other nations. This general diffusion of enlightenment has partially dispelled the quixotic spirit which formerly caused the people to fly to arms when their national pride was pricked, and has created in the minds of all, except the military classes, a yearning for undisturbed opportunities to develop the internal life of the state and to encourage the growth of the arts and the sciences. The "trusts" with their myriads of stockholders, whose businesses are hampered and restricted by frontier duties and customs, are deeply interested in obliterating state lines, at least for commercial purposes. The people have awakened to the immense economical im-

portance of a closer friendship, and realise, as never before, that their material interests are identical, while their business sense reveals to them the value of co-operative action. Hon. J. A Tawney has well said:

"We have entered upon an era of national specialisation, where all nations are more or less interdependent, where a nation relies upon other nations for some of the necessities of its life, where no nation lives to itself alone, and where none can perish without loss to the world."[1]

So closely interwoven are the business interests of the entire world that it would be "like tearing a physical organism limb from limb" for the inauguration "in our day of war between civilised states."[2]

Markets cannot be won by brute force. Customers cannot be gained at the point of a bayonet. Business relations presuppose willingness in both parties. To conquer a neighbouring country by killing its people and suppressing its commerce and industry would not be the means of securing a good customer.

The spirit of commercialism is the predominating force in the world to-day. Ideals of chivalry

[1] "The Cost of Armed Peace," *The Advocate of Peace*, August, 1909, p. 182.

[2] Prof. John B. Clark, *Advocate of Peace*, February, 1910, p. 42.

and of feudal allegiance to the head of a state, are fast dying out; and in their stead, ideals of commercial power for the state and for the individual are being held up and worshipped. In the words of Jean de Bloch, "The soldier is going down and the economist is going up." In the long run, all governments, even absolute monarchies, are swayed by the mass of their population. This is evidenced, to-day, in the attempted overturning of the Russian autocracy by the common people. Therefore, when it comes to a conflict of opinion between the people whose pockets are affected and the rulers whose pride or ambition is at stake, the people generally win. Irresistible forces are drawing the people of the world together geographically, industrially, and socially; and it is becoming more evident, day by day, that the men of all nations are inextricably involved in one great world enterprise.

The truth of this statement is manifested in the existence of the International Institute of Agriculture, the International Association of Labour Legislation, the International Postal, Telegraph, and Railway Unions, unions for mutual police assistance, the unions for the development of international sanitation, and the many semi-public associations designed to realise the ideal of a world unity in the great field of economic life.

"We speak of foreign nations [says Lord Avebury],

but in reality there are no foreign nations. The interests of the nations intermingle to such a point that we are united with one another by bonds so strong, even where they are not visible, that if one suffers, all suffer; if one prospers, the others profit by this prosperity."[1]

The burden of vast armies and navies is becoming intolerable to all classes. The people are crying out against the almost unbearable taxes which are due to the constant expenditure of money for instruments of war. A first-class battleship of to-day costs $10,000,000, which amount is greater than the valuation of the land and the one hundred buildings of Harvard University, together with all the farms and buildings of Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes. So rapidly are new inventions being introduced that a battleship becomes obsolete and is forced out of service in about ten years after it has been built.

Mr. W. T. Stead has recently declared:

"Among the real causes of the Revolution in Russia must be placed: 1. The excessive cost of the army. 2. The enormous expenditure over the navy. 3. The ruinous protective tariff which has bled the peasant in order to enrich the exchequer and the trusts. It is the economic results of these three causes which have drained the life-blood out of Russia, far more than the excesses of lawless arbitrary rule which have brought about the catastrophe."

[1] *Revue de l'Internationalisme* of June, 1907.

The people are beginning to realise that in most instances war does not pay, and are considering the business side of the matter. According to eminent French statisticians, a conflict in Europe between two first-class continental powers would cost each of them in the neighbourhood of $5,000,000 a day. The expenditure of this sum daily, in addition to the amount they could raise by the introduction of new taxes, would compel the nations to have recourse to the accumulated capital of the world's money market. New securities would have to be issued and sold in order to raise this money, and, as a consequence, the general level of values would be lowered, invested capital would be diverted, and financial loss would result to security holders.

At the present time, war on a large scale implies such gigantic economic disaster as to spell almost national ruin for each combatant and loss to the world at large.

The new battleships, torpedo boats, submarine vessels, and various munitions of war have such devastating effects on life and property, as was demonstrated during the recent Russo-Japanese conflict, that no nation can forecast the result of a war.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman pertinently asks this question:

"Is it not evident that a process of simultaneous

and progressive arming defeats its own purpose? Scare answers to scare, and force begets force, until at length it comes to be seen that we are racing one against another after a phantom security which continually vanishes as we approach. If we hold with the late Mr. Hay, that 'war is the most futile and ferocious of human follies,' what are we to say of the surpassing futility of expending the strength and substance of nations on preparations for war, possessing no finality, amenable to no allegiance that statesmen can devise, and forever consuming . . . the well-being and vitality of its people?"

Then, again, the people are realising that the effect of war is demoralising; that the tendency of war is to destroy the strong and to leave the weak and less efficient to carry on the national work and to reproduce the population; and that in most respects war is as bad as General Sherman tersely expressed it: "Its glory is all moonshine. It is only those who have neither fired a shot nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded, who cry aloud for more blood, more vengeance, more desolation. War is hell."

A war invariably leaves a nation morally, physically, and financially weaker than it was before. It leaves it morally weaker, because through war hate is developed, rapacity awakened, and lust cultivated; it leaves it physically weaker, because it is the physically strong who fight and in so many cases become invalids or die; it leaves

it financially weaker, because even success will not secure an indemnity equal to the money spent, the resources wasted, and the property destroyed.

The assertion that war is needed to make manhood, may be answered by the queries: How many soldiers should be slain in order to retemper the manhood of a nation? How can we determine when enough men have been slain in order to meet the requirements of progress?

It is a pretty weak state that can inspire its citizens with patriotic enthusiasm only by the infliction of injury on mankind or by the demonstration of its power to do so. To awaken the animal spirit in man to fight and kill is not the only way to awaken patriotic love.

A contempt for life, whether one's own or another's, which is the teaching of war and the essence of military heroism, invariably leads to the deterioration of all that is finest and best in human character. It is in direct opposition to the mission of Christ which was to value, to save, and to enrich human life.

Miss Jane Addams has wisely said:

"We may admit that the experiences of war have equipped the men of the present with pluck and energy, but to insist upon the selfsame expression for that pluck and energy would be as stupid a mistake as if we would relegate the full-grown citizen, responding to many claims and demands upon his powers, to the school-yard fight of his boyhood, or to the college

contests of his cruder youth. The little lad who stoutly defends himself on the school-ground may be worthy of much admiration, but if we find him, a dozen years later, the bullying leader of a street-gang, who bases his prestige on the fact that 'no one can whip him,' our admiration cools amazingly, and we say that the carrying over of those puerile instincts into manhood shows arrested development which is mainly responsible for filling our prisons."[1]

Then again in our day, war "depends, not, as heretofore, on individual bravery, on the power of a man's nerves, the keenness of his eye, the strength of his body, or the power of his soul, if one may so speak, but it is a mere technical mode of slaughtering your fellow-men."[2]

"It would be simply preposterous," wrote Prof. William James, "if the only force that could work ideals of honour and standards of efficiency into English or American nations should be the fear of being killed by the Germans or the Japanese."[3]

The desire of the nations is for peace. England's recent experience in South Africa has caused her to dread another war. This fear has impelled her to strain her resources in order to secure a fleet powerful enough to deter other nations from attacking her.

[1] *Newer Ideals of Peace*, p. 211.

[2] *John Bright's Speeches*, edited by Rogers, vol. ii., p. 413.

[3] "The Moral Equivalent of War," *International Conciliation*, series No. 27, p. 20.

In explaining the reasons which induced the British Government to conclude the Anglo-Japanese treaty, the Marquis of Lansdowne said:

"What are the objects of the alliance? The first is the maintenance of peace—the greatest of all British interests . . . I believe that our alliance will make, not for war, but for the maintenance of peace, and I think that we may venture to say that if Great Britain and Japan desire that peace be maintained in the Far East peace will not be broken."

France is tired of war. Her population is not increasing rapidly enough to stand the strain of warfare. Russia has learned a lesson she will never forget. Germany has had such ill-luck with her colonies in Africa and other portions of the globe that her adventurous spirit of conquest and her yearning for new possessions are somewhat quenched. Bismarck's policy to conduct affairs so as to strengthen the Fatherland and to create no diversified interests which would demand enormous expenditures for a large navy is becoming more popular with the people day by day, though the ruling powers are spreading alarm by portraying in lured tints the war spectre with a view to increasing the naval strength; while the other nations are so little prepared for war that they are compelled to crush out all desire for territorial acquisitions.

So far as the United States is concerned, there are only four nations who are powerful enough to even consider the project of attacking her, viz: England, France, Germany, and Japan. These four nations are, however, the especial friends of the United States. England and the United States are becoming more allied day by day; Germany and the United States are better friends than ever before; France and the United States have always stood hand in hand; while Japan is bound to the United States by ties of gratitude, and, outside of mischief makers, has no feeling toward the United States save that of good will.

This prevailing tendency of the nations is evidenced by the expressed views of statesmen. The statesmanship of the twentieth century is becoming far different from what it was a hundred years ago. It has now become known that some of the greatest international wars of the last century were brought on by the deliberate machinations of statesmen. The attitude of the present-day statesmen was exemplified at the celebration of the tercentenary of the discovery of Lake Champlain, in July, 1909, when President Taft, ex-Secretary of State Root, Ambassador Jusserand of France, and Ambassador Bryce of Great Britain, instead of glorifying the heroism displayed on the battle-fields about the ruins of Fort Ticonderoga, pleaded for peace, universal and permanent, President Taft saying: "I echo and emphasise the

statements of the Ambassadors, and repeat their prayer that never again may this great valley be given a name in history by reason of its being the seat of bloody war." Dr. Charles E. Jefferson has wisely said: "All the protection that a nation needs in the twentieth century is the disposition in her rulers and statesmen to love mercy and do justly, and walk as a nation ought to walk." [1]

The disease which afflicts so many to-day has been described by Dr. Jefferson in these words:

"When men become infected with the poison of militarism they have many of the symptoms of a man in delirium tremens, the world becomes filled with snakes, day and night are crowded with horrors, the universe is a hateful, hostile, hissing thing, and every moment gives birth to a new peril."[2]

This disease blinds men to the true effect of increasing armaments, so declared Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, late Prime Minister of Great Britain, in an address on December 22, 1905. He further said:

"I hold that the growth of armaments is a great danger to the peace of the world. The policy of huge armaments feeds the belief that force is the best, if not the only, solution of international differences. It is a policy which tends to inflame old sores and to create new sores; and I submit to you that as the

[1] *Some Fallacies of Militarism*, p. 5. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

principle of peaceful arbitration gains ground it becomes one of the highest tasks of statesmen to adjust armaments to the new and happier conditions."

To save nations from themselves, there must emerge from the present unparalleled increase of armaments a league of peace embracing the most advanced nations and providing an arbitral tribunal for the settlement of all disputes.

A little more than one hundred years ago no arbitration treaty had been adopted between the nations of the earth. Since then, however, treaties of arbitration have been entered into by nation after nation, until there are now nearly one hundred arbitration treaties in force, the United States alone having adopted twenty-four obligatory arbitration treaties.

The United States in 1794 led the way in negotiating with great Britain what is known as Jay's Treaty, by which the United States and Great Britain agreed to arbitrate contested boundary claims; claims preferred by British creditors; and, more especially, the claims of American and British creditors based upon "irregular or illegal captures or condemnations of their vessels and other property." Since that time, 471 international controversies, according to Dr. Darby,[1] 200, according to Mr. Fried,[2] 136,

[1] Darby's *International Tribunals*, 4th ed., pp. 769–900.
[2] Fried, pp. 125–153.

according to Prof. Moore,[1] were settled by arbitration without a single decision being rejected. All civilised nations have had recourse to arbitration, some of them many times. Arbitration is no longer an experiment; it is the prevailing practice of the nations.

Great national and international peace congresses have been held recently; more than five hundred peace societies have been organised in the various countries, with the exception of Russia and Turkey; and a great Inter-Parliamentary Union has been established with 2500 members. At the meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, held in Berlin in 1909, the Parliament of Japan, the Russian Duma, and the newly organised Turkish Parliament were represented. Side by side sat delegates from the Parliaments of England, of France, of Germany, of Austria-Hungary, of Italy, of Belgium, of the Netherlands, and of the Scandinavian nations, as well as representatives of the American Congress.

The influence which will be exerted by this Inter-Parliamentary Union was well pictured by Nicholas Murray Butler in his address at the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, May 19, 1909:

"Each year that the representatives of a national parliament sit side by side with the representatives

[1] "A Hundred Years of American Diplomacy," *14th Harvard Law Review*, No. 165, pp. 182, 183.

of the parliaments of other nations, look their colleagues in the face, and discuss with them freely and frankly important matters of international concern, it will become more difficult for them to go back and vote a declaration of war against the men from whose consultation room they have just come."

More than three hundred organisations, international in character, have been organised and are holding stated annual congresses. The delegates come from all parts of the world and, regardless of nationality and race, join hands in promoting the accomplishment of some international reform or crusade.

The exchange of visits of commissions and prominent men of one country with those of another, in official and representative character, tends to inaugurate peace. This exchange of visits has been most conspicuous among university professors, and delegates from boards of trade and chambers of commerce. Further, the Cecil Rhodes Scholarships by which fifteen German, ninety-six American, and seventy-eight colonial students are brought into contact with Englishmen at the University of Oxford are carrying out Mr. Rhodes's plan of bringing about such an "understanding between the three great Powers [as] will render war impossible," because, as he declared, "educational relations make the strongest ties."

The first formal Peace Congress of accredited

representatives of twenty-six nations met at The Hague, May 18, 1899, upon the invitation of Czar Nicholas of Russia, and was the first conference of all the nations known to history; and, disregarding strength, they met, deliberated, and voted as equals, their meetings covering a period of more than four months, and although the questions discussed were necessarily acute, general harmony prevailed.

The results of the deliberations of this First Conference have been summarised by Hon. James Brown Scott as follows:

"The work, then, of this conference took shape in three great conventions. The first was the convention for the peaceful settlement of international conflicts, which convention established: first, the right of nations to offer their good offices and mediation without having the offer or mediation considered as an unfriendly act by either or any of the contending parties; second, a commission of inquiry to ascertain the facts of an international difficulty of great and serious importance, so that the facts involved might be found impartially by a commission composed of neutrals as well as nationals; third, the convention for the pacific solution of international conflicts by providing a court of arbitration. Perhaps I would better say, provided for a court of international arbitration, because that court was to be created when the international controversy arose. Each nation was to select and appoint, and notify to a board created at The Hague, not more than four

persons of good moral character and competent in international law. In case of a conflict, each party was to select one or more from this list of judges. The judges were to select their umpire, their presiding officer, or the nations were to provide otherwise for the selection of the umpire. In order that the tribunal thus constituted might be of service, and in order that litigants might know the exact procedure to be followed before it, an elaborate system of procedure was drawn up and approved.

"The second great convention of the First Conference was the convention for the adaptation of the Red Cross to maritime warfare.

"The third great convention was the codification of the laws and customs of land warfare, which, composed by experts, assumed the proportions of an elaborate code."[1]

The Second Hague Conference assembled in 1907, and was attended by representatives from forty-four different Powers.

The Second Conference accomplished five things:

First: It unanimously agreed that no nation should hereafter have recourse to armed force for the collection of contracted debts, "unless the debtor state refuses or leaves unanswered an offer to arbitrate, or, in case of acceptance, makes it impossible to formulate the terms of submission, or, after arbitration, fails to comply with the award rendered."

[1] Document 5, *Ass'n for International Conciliation*, pp. 10, 11.

Second: It was unanimously voted by the nations present and voting that there should be established a permanent International Court of Arbitral Justice, a supreme court of the world, composed of permanent judges, versed in the systems of law existing in the modern civilised world. On account of their inability to agree on a method of selecting the judges of the court, the court was not organised, but the conference recommended that this court be established upon the basis of the project approved, and that it be organised as soon as the signatory Powers should agree upon the method of appointing judges. The exact nature of the court is defined in the first paragraph of the convention:

"In order to further the cause of arbitration, the contracting Powers agree to organise, without injury to the permanent Court of Arbitration, a Court of Arbitral Justice, free and easy of access, composed of judges representing the different judicial systems of the world and capable of assuring the continuity of arbitral jurisprudence."

Third: Over two-thirds of the nations (thirty-two Powers voting in favour and nine against) voted in favour of signing a general treaty of obligatory arbitration which would refer all questions not affecting vital honour to The Hague Tribunal. Owing to the opposition of Germany and Austria, the treaty was not adopted.

Fourth: It passed several bills which will greatly humanise any possible war.

Fifth: It provided for a meeting of a third conference within the next eight years, to be under the control of the Powers generally, instead of under any one of them.

Since 1903, more than eighty treaties of obligatory arbitration, stipulating reference to The Hague Court of all questions of a political order and those arising in the interpretation of treaties, have been concluded between nations in pairs.

In 1908, England and France signed a treaty of alliance, which pledged them to stand together in preserving the peace of Europe; Russia, Great Britain, and Norway signed a treaty making Norway neutral ground; Germany, Denmark, France, Great Britain, and Sweden signed a declaration neutralising all land bordering on the North Sea; Russia, Germany, Denmark, and Sweden signed a declaration neutralising all land bordering on the Baltic Sea; and the United States and Japan signed an agreement insuring the peace of the Pacific.

While many treaties have been adopted pledging the nations to submit their controversies to arbitration, yet with the exception of the treaties negotiated by Denmark and the Netherlands, by Denmark and Italy, and by the Argentine Republic and Chile, all the nations have refused to arbitrate questions which affect "National

Honour," "Independence," and "Vital Interests."

Mr. James Bryce has written:

"Questions of so-called national honour are often just the questions which most need to be referred to arbitration, inasmuch as they are those which a nation finds it hardest to recede from when it has once taken up a position, so that the friendly intervention of a third party is especially valuable. . . .

"The value of arbitration, or of conciliation, by a third party lies not merely in its providing a means of determining a difficult issue of law or fact, but in its making it easy for the contracting parties to abate their respective pretensions without loss of dignity."

Is war a more reliable defender of national honour than is arbitration?

In 1871, France refused to arbitrate with Germany because her dignity and honour were involved in the dispute; whereupon, through war, she sacrificed the lives of several hundred thousand of her bravest sons, and in the end lost two of her finest provinces, and paid to Germany, the assailant of her dignity, $1,000,000,000.

History clearly proves that, with nations as well as with individuals, "no man can be judge of his own cause,"[1] and render a just decision. A nation, like an individual, can see but one side of a controversy when its interests are involved, and

[1] *Brown's Legal Maxims*, 116.

is unable to view the position of its opponent calmly and fairly and, by comparing and weighing the two positions, to reach a just conclusion. Personal interest always colours the views, distorts the merits of the adverse position, and selfishly directs the judgment.

A nation's honour is never compromised by temperance nor injured by forbearance. The honour of a nation is in her own keeping and not in the keeping of her neighbour; therefore, it cannot be lost save by her own act. When the honour of a nation is impeached, the accused nation should forthwith carefully examine into the accusation in order to ascertain if it is well founded; by going to war and destroying the accusing nation, the falsity of the accusation will not thereby be adjudicated. If the accusation be true, it cannot be obliterated in the blood of the accuser, but only in the reformation of the accused; if the accusation be false, the submitting of the question of its falsity to a disinterested tribunal will bring the truth to light and shame to the unjust accuser.

"A nation's honour [said Frederick R. Coudert] consists in fidelity to her engagements, in carrying out her contracts in spirit as in the letter, in paying her just debts, in respecting the rights of others, in promoting the welfare of her people, in the encouragement of truth, in teaching obedience to the law, in cultivating honourable peace with the world."[1]

[1] *Addresses*, p. 40.

President Taft, in his speech before the Peace and Arbitration League of New York, March 22, 1910, said:

"Personally I do not see any more reason why matters of national honour should not be referred to a court of arbitration any more than matters of property or matters of national proprietorship. I know that is going farther than most men are willing to go, but I do not see why questions of honour may not be submitted to a tribunal supposed to be composed of men of honour who understand questions of national honour, to abide by their decision, as well as any other question of difference arising between nations."

Were all the wars fought in the past unjust and unchristian?

St. Mark has written:

"And they come to Jerusalem: and Jesus went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves;

"And would not suffer that any man should carry any vessel through the temple.

"And he taught, saying unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer? but ye have made it a den of thieves."[1]

[1] Mark xi., 15–17; Matt. xxi., 12, 13.

The only way by which the temple could have been cleansed was by the use of force, and force was employed by Christ. To defend, to protect, to rescue others, Christ used force; but to defend, protect, or rescue Himself, He used no force.

From the life and teachings of Christ, a nation may discern the course to be taken in its dealings with other nations. A nation may rightfully enter upon a war to save another from being destroyed, provided it has first exhausted all other means of rescuing the sister nation from threatened destruction.

If the United States did all in its power to save Cuba from being looted and destroyed by Spain, and after doing all, failed; and if it could not have saved Cuba except by war, and entered upon the war with the sole object of saving Cuba, then the Spanish-American war, so far as the United States was concerned, was a just and Christian war. If, however, Cuba could have been saved by diplomacy or mediation, then the war was unjustifiable. If, on the other hand, Cuba could have been saved by submitting the case to arbitration, the war should not have been entered upon. If the United States declared war for the purpose of gain, or aggrandisement, or in revenge for the destruction of the *Maine*, the war was unchristian, and the United States was guilty of an anti-Christian act.

Tertullian asked: "Shall it be lawful for Christians to wield the sword, when our Master declares that he who shall use the sword shall perish by the sword?"[1]

If a war be undertaken for the saving of a sister nation, the championing nation, though its object be Christian, shall nevertheless not escape the evil effects of war. "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword,"[2] said Christ; and He based this statement on the effects of war and not on the motive which precipitated the war. To act the Christian part and still be free from suffering thereby, the nations should see to it that The Hague Tribunal becomes the court to which all international controversies shall be submitted, and to its decisions all nations shall give assent.

Is it Utopian to expect that the United States and the various nations of Europe, with their diverse traits, differing languages, and peculiar customs, can be brought to adopt a general arbitration treaty which would provide for the submission of all international controversies to The Hague Court?

The putting aside of the jealousy and distrust which existed among the American colonies, and the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, and the creation of the Supreme Court before which the States, independent in all that

[1] *De Cor.*, cap. xi. [2] Matt. xxvi., 52.

relates to their domestic government, agreed to submit all controversies arising between them, seemed to many to be but a visionary and unworkable plan. Yet, for more than a century, with but one exception, the States have lived up to the terms of the Constitution and have brought to the Supreme Court all their disputes and have readily and cheerfully acquiesced in its decisions.

There is a strong analogy between the different States of the Union and the various countries of Europe, an analogy which deserves careful consideration.

A more powerful example, however, is the Federal Court of Switzerland, which settles all disputes which arise between the various cantons of that nation. These cantons are of different blood, customs, and jurisprudence. Some are French and are governed by the French code; some are German and are governed by the German law; some are Italian and are governed by the laws distinctive of Italy. Yet for centuries these states have submitted their controversies to a court which can be traced back through various modifications to the fourteenth century. The Swiss system is a clear demonstration of the fact that the ideal of a permanent tribunal for deciding controversies between people of different races is not the dream of a visionary, but a reality.

Mr. L. T. Hobhouse has recently said:

"Universal and permanent peace may be a vision; but the gradual change whereby war, as a normal state of international relations, has given place to peace as the normal state, is no vision, but an actual process of history probably forwarded in our day by the development of international law and of morals, and voluntary arbitration based thereon."[1]

Universal and enduring peace can never be maintained until the teachings of Christ become the sole rule for the guidance of the nations in their dealings with one another. To bring about the acceptance of the olive branch as the emblem of diplomacy, the enthronement of the "Golden Rule" as the guiding policy of the nations, and the adoption of Christ's plan for the settlement of all international controversies, the following means are suggested:

(1) Let ministers and Sunday-school teachers continually uphold Christ, as the "Prince of Peace," and instead of glorifying the warriors of the Old Testament, teach the Gospel of the Nazarene, that the mission of the children of God is to bring about conditions wherein there will be neither war nor rumours of war, where love will be eminently exalted in all hearts, and where brotherhood will be the sustained relationship among all the nations of the earth.

John Bright, with his keen insight into social problems, once said:

[1] *Democracy and Reaction*, p. 197.

"Why is it that there has never been a combination of all religions and Christian teachers of all countries with a view of teaching the people what is true, what is Christian, upon the subject?

"I believe it lies within the power of the churches to do far more than statesmen can do in matters of this kind. I believe they might so bring the question home to the hearts and consciences of the Christian and good men and women of their congregations, that a great combination of public opinion might be created which would wholly change the aspect of this question in this country and before the world, and would bring to the minds of statesmen that they are not the rulers of the people of Greece, or of the marauding hordes of ancient Rome, but that they are, or ought to be, the Christian rulers of a Christian people."

(2) Create ideals of peace and cease upholding military heroes as objects of worship. This may be done by the teachers of the young,—in the home, in the school, and in the church,—by picturing the suffering of Andersonville and the slaughter of Cold Harbour as vividly as the glory of Pickett's charge and the triumph of Sherman's march; by dwelling upon the horrors of war instead of the acts of heroism; by minimising the achievements of war, and by giving the achievements of peace their proper recognition; and finally, by teaching that the greatest hero is he who by calmness and self-restraint prevents a war.

Very true, indeed, are the words of the soldier and statesman Carl Schurz:

"The old Roman poet tells us that it is sweet and glorious to die for one's country. It is noble, indeed. But to die on the battlefield is not the highest achievement of heroism. To live for a good cause, honestly, earnestly, unselfishly, laboriously, is at least as noble and heroic as to die for it, and usually far more difficult."

Let the opinion of General U. S. Grant, America's great military genius, be etched deeply on the mind of every child:

"Though I have been trained as a soldier, and have participated in many battles, there never was a time when, in my opinion, some way could not have been found of preventing the drawing of the sword. I look forward to an epoch when a court, recognised by all nations, will settle international differences, instead of keeping large standing armies, as they do in Europe."

The march of time has beheld the cessation, first, of bloody contests of individuals, then of families, then of clans, then of towns, and to complete the evolution of the Christ teaching, the cessation of war between nations should be the work of Christians of the present day.

At the laying of the corner-stone of the building for the International Union of American Republics, Hon. Elihu Root, speaking as Secretary of State, said:

"There are no international controversies so serious that they cannot be settled peaceably if both parties desire peaceable settlement, while there are few causes of dispute so trifling that they cannot be made the occasion of war if either party really desires war."[1]

From the beginning of time people have been educated to war, as war was in the early stages of social development necessary to their very existence. To educate the war spirit out of the human race, ideals of peace must be implanted in the mind of every school child.

(3) Rebuke the inflammable press and the interests which stir up war talk and the war spirit, by boycotting the offending papers and ostracising the unchristian editors and proprietors.

The late John Hay said:

"If the press of the world would adopt and persist in the high resolve that war should be no more, the clangour of arms would cease from the rising of the sun to its going down, and we could fancy that at last our ears, no longer stunned by the din of armies, might hear the morning stars singing together and all the sons of God shouting for joy."

[1] *American Journal of International Law*, 1908, vol. ii., p. 624.

Rear-Admiral C. F. Goodrich has well said:

"When the people want peace, they will have peace; when they want war, they will have war, and they are likely to want that of which most is sung and written and spoken. The more we talk about peace, the less our chance for war. . . . You must labour with these gentlemen of the press, that they use their mighty powers toward allaying race hatred and toward sweetening and brightening international relations, that they report the graces and virtues of men of alien blood and speech, not their supposed defects of character, and so shall they bring all nations of earth together in that perfect understanding and sympathy in which war can have no place."[1]

(4) By creating peace societies so that public opinion may be formed and solidified to demand peace and the settlement of international disputes by the submission of all controversies to a court of international justice to be established permanently at The Hague. To-day, governments, however powerful and however popular, have ceased to dominate; everywhere public opinion dominates governments.

By the adoption of these remedies, a time will surely come when all nations of the earth will follow the example of Canada and the United States in adopting a treaty whereby the forts along the frontier separating the nations will be

[1] *Proceedings* of Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, 1907.

dismantled and peace will be maintained without a battleship, fort, or soldier, and will follow in the footsteps of Chile and the Argentine Republic, and thereby will usher in that perfect day of millennial glory when the peace of Christ shall rule the world.

The seventy-year dispute between Chile and the Argentine Republic over the boundary line on the Andes Mountains was about to culminate in a war in the early part of 1900. Both nations were draining their treasuries in preparation for the impending conflict, and their tax for armaments amounted annually to five dollars per capita of their population.

The soldiers were gathering for a desperate and fearful struggle, and hostilities were about to begin, when on Easter Sunday, owing to the powerful appeals of Bishop Bonavente of Argentine and of Bishop Jara of Chile, the hearts of the people of both countries were aroused to the horrors of war and their minds were directed to the Christian method of settling international disputes, and they arose in their might and demanded that the subject of controversy be submitted to arbitration.

The King of England was selected as arbitrator, and his decision was cheerfully accepted by both countries. So grateful were the people at the outcome of the dispute that in June, 1903, the two governments concluded a treaty by which they pledged themselves for a period of five years

to submit to arbitration all controversies arising between them, thereby entering into the first general arbitration treaty ever concluded. By a further treaty they agreed to reduce their armies to the proportions of police forces, to stop the building of battleships, and to diminish their naval armaments.

The result of this disarmament was that the battleships were sold, several marine vessels were turned over to the commercial fleets, and the land forces were reduced in number.

With the money saved by the lessening of military and naval expenses, good roads were laid out, a much needed breakwater in the harbour of Valparaiso was built, a Chilean arsenal was turned into a school for manual training, and the great trans-Andean railway connecting Buenos Ayres with Santiago was constructed.

In commemoration of the beginning of international peace and of the blessings which followed, a statue of Christ was cast from old cannons, placed on gun carriages and dragged by the soldiers and sailors of the two nations up to the summit of the Andes, where on March 13, 1904, to the sound of music and the booming of guns, the Argentines ranging themselves on the soil of Chile and the Chileans on the Argentine side of the peak which separated the two countries, the statue was unveiled.

On the crest of the highest mountain of the

Andes, which marks the boundary line of the two nations, stands a granite base weighing fourteen tons, supporting a bronze statue of Christ twenty-six feet in height. The statue represents Christ holding in His left hand a cross, while His right hand is stretched out in blessing, and gives to all the world notice of the pledge inscribed thereon:

"Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than Argentines and Chileans break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ the Redeemer."

Chile and the Argentine Republic, by their united action in enthroning Christ in their midst and in pledging themselves to bring about His teaching of "Peace on earth, good will to men," have in their limited sphere ushered in the day when the vision of the prophet Isaiah has been made a reality:

"And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION

SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION

FROM all parts of our country comes the voice of suffering humanity calling for such a reconstruction of the social life of the nation as will enable the individual to rise above the dreary, grinding, hopeless, drink-impelling, life-blood-vitiating conditions in the midst of which he lives. Many, oppressed by the "grief of things as they are," have harkened to this cry and have organised relief societies for the purpose of ameliorating these conditions; churches are awakening to their social mission; the Socialist party, with its plan for an economic re-adjustment, is rapidly gaining recruits; and wide-visioned, thoughtful, Christian people are endeavouring to reform our social conditions. The need of immediate, intelligent action is very great, but to many earnest souls the way to regenerate the social life of America seems to be enveloped in the mists of uncertainty. Some, who are eager to reconstruct society, are groping in the darkness of the frightful conditions of slum life, with no lamp to guide their footsteps and no Bethlehem-star ahead to mark their journey's end. To those who seek for guidance in uprooting social evils, curing social maladies, and righting social wrongs, the following suggestions are offered.

The first step to be taken in order to bring about a reconstruction of society is to obtain a full and complete knowledge of the social facts.

Service, to be efficient, must be based on accurate and adequate information. To work in the dark is to work bunglingly and ineffectively; while to work in the light of a clear knowledge of the facts and conditions of life, is to work with results limited only by the worker's skill and energy.

Many of the prevalent social evils are due, in a large measure, to the ignorance of those who are directly responsible for them. Ibsen says: "The devil has no stauncher ally than want of perception." This is so because human beings are so deeply engrossed in their own personal affairs that unless the bald truths, truths having power to awaken sympathy and to stir the best within them, are brought directly home to their minds and hearts, they will see only that which will directly affect themselves.

The practice of hiding the gruesome details of poverty from the eyes of the world; of glossing over the degrading conditions of tenement life; of minimising the injurious effects of certain kinds of work in factories, and of keeping silent regarding the life-sapping employment of young children, has delayed and retarded the annihilation of these conditions.

Bring captains of industry face to face with the actual conditions created by their industry, and

the mightiest leverage will be applied to their consciences. Let the world know that the millionaire mill-owner is making his money out of labour which is stunting, or crippling, or deforming children; that the wealthy tenement-house owner is giving his lavish entertainments out of money gained by housing people in such a way as to turn their healthy red blood into a sickly grey; that the prominent department-store merchant is making his fortune through the employment of girls at wages so far below the amount necessary to provide for the actual needs of life as to drive them into lives of shame, and reform will be well on the road to accomplishment.

People, generally, know little of the actual conditions existing in the city in which they live. The average rich man and woman know but little of the misery which exists at their very doors, the only poor they know being the parasites who seek them out; as a rule, they are not aware that in every large city, many human beings are shelterless; that many would gladly partake of the crumbs which fall from their bountifully laden tables; that, in the words of Prof. Edward T. Devine, "There are more kinds of misery in New York than Milton ever dreamed of in his blindness"[1]; and that many who die from a lack of food, shelter, or clothing have been entirely guiltless of wrongdoing.

[1] *Misery and its Causes*, p. 12.

It is difficult for people who possess the good things of the world and to whom life is easy, to appreciate the conditions under which others are compelled to struggle for the barest necessities of life. Class judgments are necessarily wrong; for each class views its own class from within, and all others from without. To view life from a distance is not seeing life as it really is, for, as the poet says: "Distance lends enchantment to the view."

Be a Frederick LePlay or a Charles Booth in gathering information regarding the social facts, and then blazen forth such facts, and a great impetus will be given to the work of social reconstruction.

Having learned the social facts, the next step to be taken is the investigation of the causes which have produced them.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise has said:

"In the days of hard and fast distinction between God's poor and the Devil's poor, poverty was regarded as the crime or misfortune of the individual. A truer insight into the essence of the present-day order enables us to understand that poverty is not in the main a crime of the individual; nor yet primarily is misfortune, but that poverty is a symptom of social disease, or, as some have put it, one of the stigmata of social crime. More and more we are coming to see that poverty is social in origin, social in effect, and social in outreach."[1]

[1] Sermon before the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, June 14, 1909.

Social investigators have discovered that in many cases of habitual drunkenness, the love of drink was not the cause of the individual's downfall, but that the intoxicant had become the solace of the discouraged unemployed, or the stimulant of the man made weak through malnutrition or by his unhealthful environment. The world is beginning to realise that when a man is willing to work, a long-continued lack of employment will ultimately lessen his desire to work, will weaken his ambition, will dim his ideals, and finally will bring upon him that deep-seated discouragement which leads to the seeking of oblivion in the wine cup. It is also beginning to learn that long hours at a machine which produces mental exhaustion, supplemented by a home in an insanitary tenement, with insufficient and unwholesome nourishment, will cause the red corpuscles of the man's blood to fade, and that in order to keep up his efficiency as a worker, a desire for alcoholic stimulants becomes almost irresistible.

Mr. Justice V. Liebig has wisely declared:

"It is an exception to the rule when a well-nourished man becomes addicted to whiskey. But when a man earns less than is required for the quantities of food necessary in order to restore his labour power, he is compelled by rigid and inexorable necessity to seek refuge in whiskey."[1]

[1] Quoted from Morris Hillquit, *Socialism*, p. 312.

The history of the inmates of prisons and reformatories discloses the fact that in many instances crime was the outcome of the dire needs of men and women who were willing to work, but who could secure no employment, or was the result of dissipation entered upon when their bodies had become weakened through unwholesome nourishment, unattractive environment, and long hours of daily grinding, nerve-wrecking toil, until the dead level of their existence cried out for life, for change, for stimulation. Theodore Roosevelt spoke truly when he said:

"Every wretched tenement that a city allows to exist revenges itself on the city by being a hotbed of disease and pauperism. It tends steadily to lower the tone of our city life and of our social life. The present movement for better tenement houses is an effort to cut at the root of the diseases which eat at the body social and the body politic."[1]

Other causes of human downfall are the saloon, the theatre, and the dance-hall which cater to the baser animal instincts and which are often the only places of recreation in the neighbourhood where the tired, weary, low-spirited young toiler can find vent for his natural craving for amusement.

Trace the cause of the drunkenness, prostitution, or crime to its source, and you will find that

[1] *Charities*, February 11, 1909, p. 7.

in many cases the man or the woman was the victim of bad social environment or economic maladjustment, rather than the deliberate seeker after a life of drunkenness, shame, or crime.

Dr. Carroll D. Wright has well said:

"The secondary, and often the primary, causes and encouragements of intemperance are bad air and unwholesome food, which create a craving for drink; bad company, which tempts it; undue facilities, which conduce to it; squalid homes, which drive men forth for cheerfulness; and the want of other comfortable places of resort, which leave no refuge but the publican's parlour or den. And if, on the other hand, we find that the consequences are poverty, squalid homes, brutality, crime, and the transmission and perpetuation of vitiated constitutions, who can say they cannot be prevented by the sound administration of sanitary laws, which shall prohibit the existence of bad air, of unventilated dwellings, the undue multiplication and constant accessibility of gin and beer shops, and the poisoning of wholesome food and drink?"[1]

An effort should be made to draw a sharp line of distinction between the causes of poverty for which the individual is responsible and those for which he is not. Often it will be impossible to draw such a distinction for the reason that there are a great variety of circumstances which produce the evil result and whose sources are hidden in

[1] *Some Ethical Phases of the Labour Question*, p. 55.

almost impenetrable obscurity. However difficult it may be in particular cases to press back to the original cause, no pains should be spared to reach this end.

Before pointing the finger of scorn at the man or the woman who has strayed from the paths of righteousness, we should find out who is responsible for the failure of that life, and if we learn that it was due to the starvation wages paid in the department store or the factory; or to the inability of the individual to obtain work after honestly seeking for it; or to the dark, ill-ventilated, overcrowded, and insanitary condition of the tenement in which the unfortunate was housed; or to the kind of amusement the citizens permitted to be furnished, then it is our duty to bring these facts to the attention of the world, so that the world may know the evil influence some of its people are bringing to bear to undermine social purity and to destroy human life.

The social facts being known, and the causes for the poverty, misery, and wretchedness of the many unfortunates and for the downfall of the drunkard and the criminal having been traced to their sources, the third step to be taken is the removal of the causes which are wrecking human lives.

Right and proper, just and Christian, are the efforts which are being put forth by organisations and individuals to alleviate the sufferings, to lighten the burdens, and to care for those who have

been broken and bruised in life's struggle. By all means, place ambulances at the foot of every cliff to take care of stricken humanity, but afore all other work, construct fences around all precipices so as to prevent men and women from falling. Palliative philanthropy is good, but preventative philanthropy is far better.

The day of the dole is past. Dollars do not reach the heart of the social problem. Constructive and curative measures are demanded. Many of the city's ills can be permanently cured, and the business of Christians is to remove the causes which produce the social diseases.

If insanitary tenements are productive of weakness, drunkenness, and crime, tenement laws should be enacted and enforced to make the tenements sanitary; if children are employed at work which will stunt their growth and retard their mental development, then laws should be enacted and enforced preventing children from being employed at such kinds of labour; if factories or mills are grinding out the lives of their employees by long hours or by unwholesome conditions, then factory laws to remedy such conditions should be enacted and enforced; if the wages paid by employers are insufficient for the support of a human life in a respectable manner, then such facts should be placed before the public and the parties responsible should be made to feel the enormity of their acts; if within the city there exist dance-halls,

saloons, theatres, or other places of amusement which are debasing men and women, then the city officials should be compelled to close them.

It is well to bear in mind that laws will not be enacted nor will they be enforced except upon the people's demand. If Christians, in addition to their charitable and philanthropic labour would devote some of their time to demanding the enforcement of all laws which to-day exist upon the statute books, they would soon find less need for the application of remedial measures, for, having thus removed some of the causes, there would be fewer evil effects with which to deal.

The only real remedy for the present-day social ills lies in the hands of society as it now exists. If these evils are allowed to continue in their work of corrupting and destroying life, it is because Christians are indifferent to their duties, and not because the forms and institutions of society, through which they act, are inadequate.

Unless public opinion demands a change, nothing will be changed. Present conditions reflect the qualities of human nature, and in order to change conditions the ethical standards of the people must be changed. The source of the change is to be found in human beings, and not in the institutions which have issued out of human qualities and activities.

WHAT KIND OF FENCES SHOULD BE BUILT?

It is often said in these days that the church is

doing nothing to eradicate the social evils, and that church-membership fails to include many who are seeking the social welfare of the people through non-religious organisations. There has been some ground for these complaints, for the mission of the church in the days of the past was centred upon the teaching that by prayer and fasting and church attendance men might get themselves into heaven when this life is over; and secondary in her teachings was placed the Christian doctrine, that the life hereafter depends upon the life here and now, and that it is only by giving the earthly life to the service of others that the future heavenly life may be obtained. Stress was laid only on the first of the commandments, "Love to God," whereas it should have been laid with equal force upon the second, "Love to man," for no man who does not love his brother, can love God; and no man can love his brother without loving his Father.

To-day, the church is concerned not so much with keeping men out of hell as it is with keeping hell out of them; not so much with getting men into heaven by and by as with getting heaven into them here and now; and is teaching the important truth, that it is only through love and service to man that love to God can be expressed.

By the sea of Tiberius Christ three times asked Peter if he loved Him, and each time in response Peter vehemently asserted his love. Christ then

bade him show it, not by fasting, nor by self-torture, nor by prayers, nor by church attendance, nor by withdrawal from the world, nor by silent meditation on the teachings of the Bible, but by service to his fellow-men. "Feed my lambs," "feed my lambs," "feed my sheep," were the three injunctions given by Christ.

This teaching has been taken to heart by the Church of the present day and, as a result, the church has become "not so much an association of saints as an association of saviours, not so much a witness of redemption as an instrument of redemption, not so much an ark of refuge as a missionary ship."[1]

Charity apart from religion is of but slight avail, for without religion charity is but the outcome of a passing mood, a tender impulse, or an act of vanity. Charity is applied religion. Charity is the fruit grown on the tree of religion,—it is the result of a religious life.

A religion not expressed in charitable acts is a religion not worthy of the name. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Love is the greatest force in the world; it is the only solvent which can melt the stony heart; it is the only power which can transform a human life.

Every wrong we commit is owing to our lack of Christian love; for if we loved our neighbour as

[1] *The Approach to the Social Question*, by F. G. Peabody, p. 98.

Christ loved us, it would be impossible for us to do him a wrong.

Poverty and love cannot abide together, for where love is, poverty ceases to exist. Injustice and love are strangers; starvation wages and love are incompatible; insanitary tenements and love have no affinity. Love will remove all that hinders or hampers mankind; it will not only raise the fallen but, by filling up all holes and fencing all precipices, will prevent the brother or sister from falling. Love will make the desert to blossom like the rose, and human life to be as free as that of the birds of the air.

Love for mankind should not be postponed until fortunes are made, or power or place obtained. A captain of industry who starves and maims and crushes humanity in his industrial war cannot find redemption by providing ambulances and hospitals to take care of the wrecks of humanity lying stricken on the fields of industrial battle.

Christ said: "Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?"

The placing of human life above material things is the need of the day. The world has yet to learn to value human life above those things "which moth and rust doth corrupt" and which pass from one's possession when death comes. Pastor Stöcker of Berlin, in a speech on child and female labour, in the German Reichstag, said:

"We have stated the question the wrong way. We have asked, how much child and female labour does industry need in order to flourish, to pay dividends, and to sell goods abroad? Whereas, we ought to have asked, how ought industry to be organised in order to protect and foster the family, the human individual, and the Christian life?"

Christ's standard of value should enter into every business and professional act and be the determining factor in every decision.

Until love for mankind, the placing of the highest value upon men and women, takes possession of the Christian, the coining of human life into money through the sweat-shops, the insanitary basement conditions of the department stores, the long hours of dreary toil in the factories, the employment of children for long hours at hard labour, and the home life in unwholesome tenements will continue to exist in our industrial and commercial life, blighting and destroying human beings, children of the most high God.

Christ did not despise the physical body, but, on the contrary, taught that it was the Father's most prized handiwork. "The very hairs of your head are all numbered," He said. He recognised the needs of the body when He taught men to pray, "Give us this day our daily bread," and when He admonished the twelve disciples on sending them out into the world: "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils."

Though He directed the alleviation of physical suffering and disease, He placed His main emphasis on the command of brotherliness and neighbourliness, the evidence of which would be in the removing of all causes which produce misery and suffering to humanity.

Christ did not carry the leper's bed, but gave the man strength to carry his own bed. To help one to help himself was Christ's way of serving mankind.

"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," commanded Christ.

Spectral Christians, mere church-going men, are not treating their employees as they would wish to be treated were their places reversed, and are using their property solely for the monetary returns they derive therefrom. The thought of stewardship never enters their mind; the Golden Rule never governs their business dealings.

Society will never be regenerated and reconstructed until the teachings of Christ have been intelligently applied to the social, economic, industrial, and political life. To enthrone justice in place of "every man for himself," love in place of indifference, and human life in place of the golden coin, are the duties resting on every child of God.

Society will never be regenerated and reconstructed until the individuals who compose it have been regenerated and reconstructed. Many social ills can be mitigated through legislation, public

opinion, and social ostracism, but society as a whole can never be purified, ennobled, or uplifted, until the individuals who make up its membership live according to the example and teachings of Christ.

The Socialists' plan to permanently change the individual by changing his environment, to apply change from without instead of educing it from within, may be likened to the action of the gardener in *Alice in Wonderland* who painted the white rose red. Temporary change may be effected by such a method, but the white rose will still be white despite its veneer of red.

The fact should be kept clearly in mind that one can no more escape influencing the opinions of those whom one meets in daily life, nor assisting in the formation of public opinion—the most powerful reformative agency in American life—by burying one's head in the sands of selfishness, or by fleeing into the towers of one's self-interest and raising high the drawbridge, than one can go through this world without his body casting a shadow.

Personal influence is a silent, pervading, magnetic thing. It works in inexplicable ways. We neither see nor hear it, yet, consciously or unconsciously, we exert it. No one can think or speak or act—in fact, no one can live, without having an effect on the lives of others.

The average Christian sits back in his cushioned

pew on Sunday and listens complacently and forgetfully to the discourse of the preacher, and spends his week-days amid the engrossing affairs of business and his evenings with his family, taking but little notice of what goes on about him. When some reformer or crusader brings to his notice the evil conditions which exist almost at his very door, he is so horrified that he often gives his check to alleviate such sorrow or trouble and then settles back into his comfortable mode of living, and lends no helping hand to uproot the abuses which are the source of human misery and degradation.

It seldom occurs to the giver that "man does not live by bread alone," and that though bread is vitally important to the hungry, yet giving of "bread alone" does not fulfil the Christian obligation. The unfortunate often needs the touch of a kindly hand, a gentle look, and the sound of a friendly voice in order that he may gain new courage, new hope, and a fresh determination to live a better life.

Christ always began with the individual and sought first to bring him into filial relations with God, and second to impress upon him the fact that he stands in vital and unescapable relationship with the race, and set him the example of expressing love to mankind, by going about healing the sick, casting out devils, implanting high ideals, and teaching men and women how to live

the fullest and most complete life here on earth.

Christ began the reformation of society by reforming individuals, for character determines the way in which men approach the problems of society, and in the end determines the solution which they receive.

Each city constitutes a single social body, which, in some respects, is similar to a human body.

In order to have a healthy physical body, every part must be in a healthy condition; if one part is diseased, the rest of the body suffers: and if no curative remedies are applied to the diseased portion, the inevitable result is that the disease will spread through the whole body, finally causing death.

Comte has said that

"the state of every part of the social whole at any time is intimately connected with the contemporaneous state of all others . . . all are in close mutual dependence on one another, insomuch that, when any considerable change takes place in one, we may know that a parallel change in all the others has preceded or will follow it."

If the social body of a city is to be healthy, no part of it can be diseased. Unfortunately, all municipal social bodies in America are suffering from many diseases at the present time. There are many festering spots needing attention; there

are many forces at work destroying life-giving powers.

Not only do these diseased conditions exist within the social body, but germs of devastating diseases are being introduced into it from other social bodies. Care must be exercised not only to destroy the evil powers within, but also to prevent the contraction of the diseases which exist in other social bodies throughout the world.

If the social body of a city is strong and healthy, it will not bring contagion to other social bodies with which it comes in contact; but if it be diseased, it will spread contagion everywhere.

The large social body of America will live just so long as it prevents disease from sapping its vitals and corrupting its life. Babylon, Greece, and Rome decayed and perished because their diseased parts were ignored, and no attempt was made to purify or cure them. The large cities are the diseased spots on the American social body, and unless every healthful American becomes a social physician and surgeon and dedicates his life to the eradication of social diseases, America will eventually sicken and die as did those powerful nations of old.

Gilbert K. Chesterton defines the way in which a city can be reformed in these words:

"It is not enough for a man to disapprove of Pimlico: in that case he will merely cut his throat

or move to Chelsea. Nor, certainly, is it enough for a man to approve of Pimlico: for then it will remain Pimlico, which would be awful. The only way out of it seems for somebody to love Pimlico: to love it with a transcendental tie and without any earthly reason. If there arose a man who loved Pimlico, then Pimlico would rise into ivory towers and golden pinnacles; Pimlico would attire herself as a woman does when she is loved. For decoration is not given to hide horrible things, but to decorate things already adorable. A mother does not give her child a blue bow because he is so ugly without it. A lover does not give a girl a necklace to hide her neck. If men loved Pimlico as mothers love children, arbitrarily, because it is theirs, Pimlico in a year or two might be fairer than Florence. Some readers will say that this is a mere fantasy. I answer that this is the natural history of mankind. This, as a fact, is how cities did grow great. Go back to the darkest roots of civilisation and you will find them knotted round some sacred stone or encircling some sacred wall. People first paid honour to a spot and afterwards gained glory for it. Men did not love Rome because she was great. She was great because they loved her."[1]

A man who enters politics for money and private gain, is no worse than the man who remains out of politics for the money and private gain to be made in business. He who fails to work for his city's welfare is on a par with the man who uses

[1] *Orthodoxy*, pp. 122, 123.

his city for his personal enrichment, for it is the neglect of good men to fulfil their duties as citizens which makes possible the manipulation and corruption of politics for private gain.

If every man and woman bearing the name of Christian will become a Christian in fact, and will endeavour, by patient investigation and honest study, to find out the facts concerning the social evils existing to-day, and will throw upon them the clear light of publicity and blazon them abroad, condemning them with the whole power of being, and will exemplify by their lives the teachings of Christ, and finally, whenever a leader raises the banner of reform and seeks to enlist recruits to destroy some evil stronghold, will cheerfully and energetically lend a helping hand, American industrial and political life will begin to be reformed, regenerated, and reconstructed, and the social life of the American people will ultimately be re-created so that justice, mercy, and peace will be the heritage of every citizen,—and the "Kingdom of God" will be realised here on earth.

INDEX

A

Acts,
i., 3—118
ii., 42–47—249
iv., 32–35—249
v., 4—250
ix., 1–22—146
Adam and Eve, *see* Marriage, origin of
Adams *vs.* Palmer, 162
Addams, Jane, on War and manhood, 360, 361
Adler, F., on Marriage, 165, 166
Am. Society of Sanitary and Moral Prophylaxis, *see* Marriage
Anarchy, 18–28
Christ on, *see* Christ
Definition, 19
Government, *see* Government
Bakunin, M., 21
Diderot, 19
Federation of Jura, 22
Huxley, Prof., 23
Int. Alliance, 21, 22
Kropatkin, P., 22, 23
La Boetie, 19
La Fontaine, 19
Münzer, 19
Proudhon, P. J., 21
Rabelais, 19
Salter, W. H., 23
Stirner, M., 19, 20
Anderson, M. B., on Christianity, 14
Wealth, use of, 266, 267
Arabia, Mohammedanism in, 10
Arbitration, duty of
International, *see* International controversies
Labour, *see* Labour
Personal disputes, 156
Asarias, Brother, on Religious education, 230
Avebury, Lord, on
Christians, 348
Unity of nations, 357
Aveling, E.,
Socialist leader, 35
Socialism *vs.* Christianity, 107, 108

B

Babeuf, on Socialism, 34
Bakunin, M., on Anarchy, 21
Baldwin, Prof., on Public opinion, 4
Baudrillat, M., on Luxuries, 272
Bax, B.,
God, belief in, 71
Immortality, 83
Marriage, 55, 56
Materialism, 41
Religion, permanency of, 88
Socialism *vs.* Christianity, 108, 109
Socialist leader, 35
Society, uplifting, 66
Violence, use of, 103, 104
World, other, 83, 84

Bebel, A.,
Churches, war on, 111
God, belief in, 76, 77
God, obedience to, 79
Man, redemption of, 86
Marriage, on, 52, 53
Religion, permanency of, 91
Socialism *vs.* Christianity, 112
Socialist leader, 35
State to be abolished, 96
Violence, use of, 99, 100
Beccaria on Crime, 210
Black, H., on Work, 310
Blackstone, W., on Marriage, 161
Blanc, L., on Socialism, 34
Boise, H. M.,
Crime, treatment of, 210
Heredity, 244
Religious education, 229, 230
Bolce, H., on Marriage and divorce, 185, 186
Booth, Mrs. M. B.,
Ex-convict, 237–239
Prisoners, 204, 205
Brahma, effect of, in India, 10
Bright, J.,
Peace, 379
War, 361
Brinkerhoff, Gen. R.,
Prisoners, 205, 206
State use system, 226, 227
Brotherhood, *see* Christ
Brown, H. B., on Marriage license, 174
Browning, R., marriage of, 176
Bryce, James,
National honour, 372
Public opinion, 2
Buddha, effect of, in India, 10
Buonarotti, on Socialism, 33, 34
Butler, N. M., on Inter-parliamentary union, 366, 367

C

Campbell-Bannerman, H.,
Arbitration, 364, 365
War folly, 359
Campbell, R. J., Christ a Socialist, 31
Capital punishment, *see* Criminal
Carlyle, T.,
Education, 224
Political economy, 302
Work, 313
Carnegie, A., on Wealth, use of, 280–282
Carpenter, C., on Marriage, 56, 57
Catholic Church, *see* Roman
Channing, Dr., on War, 347
Charity, 398–401
Lecky on, 12
Chesterton, G. K., on City upbuilding, 407, 408
Chicago Platform, *see* Platform
Children, employment of, *see* Labour
China, condition of, 10
Christ,
an Anarchist, 24–28
Hyndman, H. M., 25
Rehan, E., 24, 25
Tolstoi, Count, 25
Effect of teachings, 11–15
Anderson, Pres., 14
Hillis, N. D., 14, 15
Lowell, J. R., 12, 13
Webster, D., 13, 14
Jenks, Prof. J., on, 11
Martineau, J., on, 11
Mission of, 11, 118, 119, 139, 345
a Socialist, *see* Socialism
Teachings on,
Brotherhood, 11, 12, 121, 122, 345
Capital punishment, 235
Childlikeness, 122

Christ (*Continued*)
Classes of mankind, 39
Courts, *see* Non-resistance
Crime, *see* Criminal
Criminal, *see* Criminal
Evil, resisting, *see* Non-resistance
Faithfulness, 257, 258
Fatherhood of God, 121
Forgiveness, 156
God, belief in, 69–71
Obedience to, 79, 80
Government, 25–28, 93–95
Oppression of, *see* Non-resistance
Reformation of, 150, 151
Heredity, 243, 244
Immortality, 83, 84
Judgment, last, 131, 132
Juveniles, 212–214
Kingdom of God, *see* Kingdom of God
Law, obedience to, *see* Non-resistance
Love, 12, 129–135, 139, 151, 345, 399–401
Man,
Development, 65
Redemption, 86
Value of, 401
Marriage, *see* Socialism, and Marriage
Materialism, 41–45
Men of wealth, *see* Wealth
Nature, human, change of, 64
Non-resistance, *see* Non-resistance
Ostracism, social, 295, 296
Physical violence, *see* Non-resistance
Power of, 150
Property, ownership of, *see* Wealth
Religion, permaneney of, 86, 87
Reputation, injury to, *see* Non-resistance
Sacrifice, 265
Service, 122, 123, 129, 130, 151
Simple life, 265
Social ostracism, 295, 296
Society, changing, 68
Soul, *see* Immortality
Value of, 264, 265
Spiritual aim, 41–44
State, *see* Government
Talents, use of, 256, 257, 259
Violence, 98
War, 346, 348, 374, 375
Wealth, *see* Wealth
Wealthy men, *see* Wealth
Will, freedom of, 63
Work, 304–306, 309, 310, 312
World, other, 82, 85
Christianity, *see* Christ
Christianity *vs.* Socialism, *see* Socialism
Churches, abolished, 110, 111
on Divorce, 197
on Peace, 378, 379
on War, 111, 112, 378, 379
on Wealth, 296
Citizens, U. S.,
Admission of, 124–129
Duty of, 17, 124–130
Limitations of, 1
Oath of, 128
Power of, 1, 2
Citizens' Industrial Assn., 321

Cleave, 167
Clement XI, education of criminals, 233
Clement of Alexandria, use of wealth, 266
Colleges, on Marriage and divorce, 184–186, 196
on Wealth, 296
Collins, C. V., on Prison buildings, 219
Communist manifesto,
on Marriage, 61
on Property, private, 47
State to be abolished, 94, 95
Community of goods, *see* Wealth, private
Comte, on Unity of society, 406
Confucius, effect of, in China, 10
Constitution,
State,
to Abolish, 2
to Change, 2
United States,
to Abolish, 1
Change of, 1
Definition of, 1
Formation of, 1
Convert of Moody, 141
Cooley, C. H.,
Corporations, 289
Nation, 345
Use of wealth, 267
Cor. 2, viii., 9, 13, 14, 249
Corporations,
Business of, 288
By-law of, 293
Sermon on Mount, 293
Definition of, 288, 289
Cooley on, 289
Development of, 287, 288, 319, 320
Directors of, 289, 292
Ross, E. A., on, 291, 292
Employees of, 289, 290, 292, 293
Number of, 320, 321
Moody on, 320, 321
Officers of, 289–292
Ross, E. A., on, 291, 292
Reform of, 294–297
Ostracism, social, 294–296
Christ on, 295, 296
Publicity, 294
Public opinion, 294
Teaching in,
Churches, 296
Colleges, 296
Schools, 296
Stockholders, 289–292
Liddon, Dr., on, 292
Ross, E. A., on, 291, 292
Coudert, F. R., on National honour, 373, 374
Courage, Wright, R., on, 145
Courts,
Abolishment of, 148–150
Christ on, 149, 150
Industrial, *see* Labour
International, *see* International arbitration
Tolstoi on, 148, 149
Use of, 156
Coward, *see* Courage
Criminal
Capital punishment, 235
Christ on, 235
Crime, 199–244
Christ on, 199–204, 226
Disease, a, 231, 232
Ex-convict, 236–243
Booth, Mrs. M. B., on, 237–239
Christ on, 236
Heney F. J., on, 240, 241
Potter, Bishop H. C., on, 237
Trusting, 242, 243
Christ on, 242

Criminal (*Continued*)
Leonard, J. A., on, 242, 243
Nelson, Lord, on, 242
Heredity, 243, 244
Boise, H. M., on, 244
Christ on, 243, 244
Indeterminate sentences, 230–233
Christ on, 230
Lydston, Dr. G. F., on, 232
Maconochie on, 233
Individual attitude, 208, 209
Judgment, and, 207
Christ on, 207
Tolstoi, L., on, 207, 208
Juvenile Court, *see* Juvenile Court
Parole Board, *see* Parole Board
Prison, *see* Prison
Prisoners,
Booth, Mrs. M. B., on, 204, 205
Brinkerhoff, Gen. R., on, 205, 206
Christ on, 199
Probation, *see* Probation
Punishment, 209–211
Beccaria on, 210
Boise, H. M., on, 210
Capital, 235
Masten, V. M., on, 210, 211
Society and, 206
Criminaloid, *see* Ross, E. A.
Crosby, E. H.,
on Tolstoi, 142–145
on War, 347, 348

D

Darwin, C., on Idleness, 307
Debs, E. V.,
on Marriage, 59–61
Socialist leader, 35
Deut. xxiv., 1, 2—169
Devine, E. T., on Misery, 391
Diderot on Anarchy, 19
Dietzgen, J.,
God, belief in, 78
Obedience to, 79, 80
Man, redemption of, 86
Religion, permanency of, 88
Socialism *vs.* Christianity, 109, 110
Socialist leader, 35
Violence, use of, 102, 103
Diseases,
Great Black Plague, 178
Social, 178
Tuberculosis, 177
Divorce,
Bolce, H., on, 185, 186
Christ on, 168, 169, 180–182, 189
Evans *vs.* Evans, 192, 193
Gibbons on, 192
Gibbons, J. C., on, 189
Giddings, F. H., on, 185
Greece, in, 187
Greeley, H., on, 188, 189
Grounds for,
Deuteronomy, 167–169
Genesis, 167
Jews on, 167–169
Mosaic law, 167–169
Rabbis on, 167–169
Howard, G. E., on, 184
Hume on, 191, 192
Milton on, 188
Remedies for, 193–197
Education, 194–197
Churches, 197
Clergymen, 197
Colleges, 196
Home training, 194–196

Divorce (*Continued*)
Krauskopf, Rabbi, on, 194, 195
Schools, 196
Sunday-schools, 197
Temperance, 197
Ground, single, 193, 194
License, *see* Marriage
Physical health, *see* Marriage
in Rome, 187
Savage, Rev. M. J., on, 182, 183
Separation, *see* Separation
Statistics in,
Austria, 191
Belgium, 191
England, 191
France, 190
Germany, 190, 191
Hungary, 191
Ireland, 191
Italy, 191
Netherlands, 191
Norway, 191
Scotland, 191
Sweden, 191
Switzerland, 190
U. S., 189–191
Wales, 191
Thompson, F., on, 188
U. S. census on, 189–191
Ward, Mrs. H., on, 186
Wright, Dr. C. D., on, 182
Zueblin, C., on, 184, 185
Doukhobor, on Christianity, 349

E

Education,
effect on Crime, *see* Criminal
effect on Divorce, 194–197
Eight-hour day, *see* Labour
Eliot, C. H., on Religious education, 228, 229
Ely, R. T., on Luxuries, 272, 273
Emerson, R. W., on Reputation, 148
Emil on Use of wealth, 282
Engels, F.,
Classes of mankind, 39
God, belief in, 77, 78
Obedience to, 80, 81
Leader of socialism, 35
Marriage, 53, 54
Materialism, 42, 43
Religion, permanency of, 89–91
Society changing, 68
State to be abolished, 94
World, other, 80, 81
Erfert Programme, *see* Platform
Evans *vs.* Evans, 192, 193
Eve, *see* Marriage, origin of
Evil, resisting, *see* Non-resistance
Ex-convict, *see* Criminal

F

Factory arts, 290
Family,
Social unit, 159
Unit of society, 159
Farre, Dr. J. R., on Rest period, 335, 336
Fatherhood of God, *see* Christ
Federal Constitution, *see* Constitution, U. S.
Federation of Jura, *see* Anarchy
Ferri, E.,
Religion, permanency of, 87
Socialism *vs.* Christianity, 109
Socialist leader, 35
Violence, use of, 101
Forgiveness, *see* Christ
Fourier on Socialism, 34
Fulton, J., on Marriage, 162, 163

G

Gambling, 268–270
Gates, Prof., on Religious instruction, 227, 228
Genesis, i., 1—304
i., 26, 27—163
ii., 7, 15, 18, 21–23—164
ii., 24—164
Gibbons on Marriage and divorce, 191, 192
Giddings, Prof.,
Marriage and divorce, 185
Monopoly, 261, 262
Public opinion, 3
Gladden, Rev. W.,
Christianity, end of, 133, 134
Individual opinion, 8, 9
Gladstone, W. H., on Social welfare, 160
God,
Belief in,
Christ, 69–71
Socialism, 69–78
Kingdom of God, *see* Kingdom of God
Marriage, *see* Marriage
Obedience to,
Christ, 79, 80
Socialism, 79–81
Goodrich, C. F., on Press and war, 352
Government,
Abolishing, 149, 150
Christ on, 25, 28, 94–96, 149, 150
Definition, 23, 24
Century dictionary, 24
Grave, J., 24
Salter, W. N., 24
Tucker, B. R., 23
Reformation of, 150, 151
Socialism, 94–97
Grant, U. S., on War, 390
Grave, J., on Government, 24
Great Black Plague, *see* Marriage, Health
Greeley, H., on Marriage and divorce, 188, 189
Gunton, G., on Wealth, 247

H

Hadley, Dr. A. T., on Individual opinion, 6, 7
Hague Court, *see* International controversies
Harnack, A., on Use of wealth, 266
Hay, J., on Press and war, 381, 382
Health, bill of, *see* Marriage
Heaven, Kingdom of, *see* Kingdom of God
Helpmeet, definition of, 164
Henderson, C. R., on Minimum wage, 284
Heney, F. J., on Ex-convict, 240, 241
Herron, G. D.,
Marriage, 58, 59
Materialism, 45
Socialism *vs.* Christianity, 108
Socialist leader, 35
Hillis, N. D., on Christianity, 14, 15
Hillquit, M.,
Materialism, 45
Socialist leader, 35
Society changing, 68
Violence, use of, 104–106
Hirsch, Dr., on Education, 224
Hobhouse, L. T., on Universal peace, 378
Holzmann, O., on Christ a Socialist, 31
Home-training, *see* Divorce
Honesty, *see* Wealth, Accumulation
Horse-racing, 268–270
Howard, G. E., on Marriage and divorce, 184

Hume on Marriage and divorce, 191, 192
Huxley, Prof.,
Anarchy, 23
Learning and Doing, 15
Hyndmann, H. M.,
Christ an Anarchist, 25
Marriage, 61, 62

I

Idleness, *see* Labour
Immortality,
Christ on, 83, 84
Socialism on, 83
Indeterminate sentences, *see* Criminal
India, condition of, 10
Indiana physical health law, 180
Individual, *see* Unit
International Alliance, *see* Anarchy
International bodies,
Cecil Rhodes Scholarship, 367, 368
Inter-Parliamentary Union, 366
Butler, N. M., on, 366, 367
Number of, 367
Peace congress, 366
First, 368
Results of, 368, 369
Second, 368–371
Results of, 368–371
International controversies, 343–385
Armaments, *see* War preparations
Controversies, 348, 349
Court, world,
Submission to, 351
Switzerland Federal Court, 377, 378
U. S. Supreme Court, 376, 377
Disease, C. E. Jefferson on, 364
Hague Court, 368–371
Treaties referring to, 371
Independence, 372
Nation, definition of, 345, 346
Cooley on, 345, 346
National honour, 372–374
Bryce, J., 372
Coudert, F. R., on, 373, 374
France and Germany, 372
Germany and France, 372
Taft, Pres., 374
Nations,
Dealing of,
Basis, 346
Christ on, 346, 348
Unity of, *see* Cosmopolitanism
Remedy,
Alliance, world, 376–378
Hobhouse, L. T., on, 378
Switzerland, 377, 378
U. S. Government, 376, 377
Arbitration, 350, 351
Christ, 349–351
Cosmopolitanism, 354–357
Avebury, Lord, 357
Tawney, J. A. 355
International bodies, *see* International bodies
Ministers, teach peace, 378, 379
Bright, J., 379
Negotiation, 350

International (*Continued*)
Peace societies,
Number of, 366
Value of, 382, 383
Press, 381, 382
Goodrich, C. F., on, 381, 382
Hay, J., on, 381, 382
Social ostracism, 351
Sunday-schools, teach peace, 378, 379
Treaties, *see* Treaties
Root, E., 381
Vital interests, 372
War,
Attitude toward,
Christ's, 346, 348
France, 362
Germany, 363
Russia, 362
Statesmen, 363, 364
Bryce, J., 363
Campbell-Bannermann, H., 364, 365
Jefferson, C. E., 364
Jusserand, 363
Root, E., 363
Taft, Pres., 363, 364
Christian,
Christ, 374–376
Cuba and U. S., 375, 376
U. S. and Cuba, 375, 376
Evils of, 346–348, 359–361
Channing, Dr., 347
Crosby, E. H., 347, 348
Doukhobor, 349
Grant, U. S., 380
Lowell, J. R., 346, 347
Sherman, W. T., 359
Necessary for manhood, 360, 361
Addams, Jane, 360, 361
James, W., 361
Schurz, C., 380
Preparations for, 351–353
Battleship, cost of, 357
Campbell-Bannermann, H., 359
Schurman, J. G., 352, 353
Stead, W. T., 357, 358
U. S. in, 353

J

James v., 1–8—249
James, W., on War and manhood, 361
Jaures, J.,
God, obedience to, 79
Man, development of, 65
Marriage, 50
Private property, 46
Socialist leader, 35
Jefferson, C. E.,
Statesmen and war, 364
War a disease, 364
Jenks, Prof. J.,
Christ's influence, 11
Effect of individual opinion, 8
Jevons on Wealth, 247
John i., 51—70
ii., 1, 21—251
iii., 3—64
v., 2–17—335
v., 17—304
vi., 15—25

John (*Continued*)
vi., 27—44
vii., 26, 27—142
viii., 12—65
viii., 50—251
viii., 59—142
x., 10—65
x., 39—142
xi., 1–44—132
xiii., 29—248
xiv., 2—82
xiv., 15—80
xv., 14—80
xvii., 25, 26—71
xviii., 10, 11—98
xviii., 33–38—26
xix., 39—251
xx., 17—71
John the Baptist, 117, 118
Juvenile Court, 211–214
Basis of, 212, 213
Christ on, 212, 214
Lindsey, B. B., 211, 212
Procedure of, 213

K

Kautsky, K.,
Marriage, 54
Nature, human, change of, 64
Socialist leader, 35
Kerr, C. H.,
Marriage, 57, 58
Socialist leader, 35
Violence, use of, 101, 102
Kingdom of God, 115–135
Admission to, 124–129
Christ,
Aim supreme, 119
Chief teaching, 118, 119
Reward of seeking, 119
Citizenship in, 124–129
Forfeiting, 125–129
Growth in, 130
Renewing, 125–129
Test of, 130–132
Time of, 129
Cornerstones of, 120–123
Brotherhood of man, 121, 122
Childlikeness of spirit, 122
Fatherhood of God, 121
Serviceableness, 122, 123
Growth of, 130
Heaven, Kingdom of, 118, 119
Hebrew term, 115
Belief in, 115–117
Conception of, 115–117
John the Baptist, 117, 118
Threefold interpretation, 119, 120
Future state, 120
Inward presence, 119
Present condition, 119, 120
Kingdom of Heaven, *see* Kingdom of God
Krauskopf, Rabbi, on Divorce, 194, 195
Kropatkin, P., on Anarchy, 22, 23

L

La Boetie on Anarchy, 19
Labour, 299–328
Black, H., 310
Capital *vs.*, 324–326
Ross, J., 325, 326
Children, employment of, 316, 317
Lovejoy, O. R., on, 316, 317
Christ on, 304–306, 309, 310
Citizens Industrial Assn., 321
Duty to, 304–307
Eight-hour day, 314–316
Mitchell, J., on, 315, 316

Labour (*Continued*)
Idleness, 306–310
Danger of, 306, 310
Darwin, C., on, 307
Employable, 308
Incorrigibles, 309
Unemployable, 308, 309
Vagrants, 309
Vicious, 309
Motive for, 311–313
Carlyle, T., 313
Christ, 312
Wilson, W., 313
Murillo's picture, 310
Political economy, *see* Political economy
Profits, division of, 317
Reward of, 305–307
Solution of problem, 323–328
Arbitration, 326, 327
Wright, C. D., 326, 327
Boycott, 328
Christ, 323–328
Court, 327, 328
Lock-outs, 322–328
Mediation, 323–326
Separation, final, 328
Strikes, 322–328
Unfair list, 328
Unions, 321–328
Growth of, 321
Object of, 322
Strength of, 322
Vocational training, 318, 319
Laughlin, J. L., on, 318, 319
Wages, 317, 318
Wishart, A. W., on, 311
Labriola, A.,
God, belief in, 71, 72
Socialist leader, 35
Will, freedom of, 63
Ladoff, I.,
Socialism *vs.* Christianity, 107
Socialist leader, 35
Lafargue, P.,
God, belief in, 75, 76
Immortality, 82
Man, development of, 65
Marriage, 62
Religion, permanency of, 90, 91
Socialist leader, 35
La Fontaine on Anarchy, 19
Lalone, M., on Imprisonment, 215
Lamb, C., on Marriage, 171
La Monte, R. R.,
God, belief in, 73–75
Marriage, 51, 52
Materialism, on, 43
Religion, permanency of, 92, 93
Socialist leader, 35
State to be abolished, 96, 97
Will, freedom of, 63
L'Ange on Socialism, 33, 34
Lansdown, Marquis, on Treaties, 362
Laughlin, J. L., on Vocational training, 318, 319
Laveleye, M. de, on Luxuries, 272
Law, obedience to, *see* Non-resistance
Leatham, J., on Socialism *vs.* Christianity, 109, 110
Lecky on Charity, 12
Legal injustice, *see* Non-resistance
Leonard, J. A., on Trusting, 242, 243
Lewis, C. T., on Men and acts, 217
License, *see* Marriage
Liddon, Dr., on Responsibility, 292
Liebig, J. V., on Drinking, 393
Liebknecht, W.,
Socialist leader, 35
Socialist platform, 38
Violence, use of, 100, 101
World, other, 82

Lincoln, A.,
Enmity, 147
Honesty, 264
Maligners, 146, 147
Mother's advice to, 139
Stanton, E. M., 264
Lindsey, B. B., on Juveniles, 211, 212
Liquor, 268–270
Lock-out, *see* Labour
Lord's Day, *see* Sunday
Loria, A.,
Socialist leader, 35
Religion, permanency of, 89
Louis XIV. on Spending money, 270
Love, *see* Christ
Lovejoy, O. R., on Employment of children, 316, 317
Lowell, J. R.,
Christianity, 12, 13
War, 346, 347
Luckock, H. B.,
Cleave, 167
on Helpmeet, 164
Luke,
ii., 14—139
ii., 49—309
vi., 1–4—334
vi., 16–31—250
vi., 30, 46—247
viii., 2, 3—250
x., 1–11—118
x., 8–11—295
x., 20—85
x., 29–37—346
x., 39–42—44
xi., 2—82
xi., 9—63
xi., 27, 28—151
xii., 15, 44—252
xii., 16–21—253
xii., 33, 46—248
xiii., 11–17—334
xiii., 29—39
xiv., 1–6—334
xiv., 28—63
xiv., 33—63
xv., 11–32—126, 127
xv., 20–24—296
xvi., 10–12—258
xvi., 18—51
xvii., 3—296
xvii., 20, 21—117
xviii., 17—64
xviii., 18–25—250, 254
xviii., 26, 30—83
xix., 1, 10—251
xix., 5—247
xix., 5, 8, 9—47
xix., 11–27—257
xx., 25—94
xxi., 33—87
xxii., 35, 36—46
xxii., 42—79
xxii., 50, 51—98
xxii., 69–72—70
xxiii., 1, 2, 13–15—96
xxiii., 34—145
xxiii., 43—83
xxiv., 34—332
xxiv., 36–43—332
Luxuries, *see* Wealth, administration of

M

Maconochie, on Indeterminate sentence, 233
Man,
Development of,
Christ, 65
Socialism, 65
Redemption of,
Christ, 86
Socialism, 86
Mark,
i., 15—118
i., 20—251
ii., 27—335
iv., 28—130
iv., 30–32—134
x., 5–9—50
x., 11, 12—51, 169
x., 15—64
x., 17–31—248
x., 26, 27—86
x., 29—83

Mark (*Continued*)
xi., 15–17—153, 375
xii., 17—94
xii., 28–31—345
xii., 29, 30—69
xii., 30, 31—68
xiv., 36—79
xiv., 65—146
xvi., 7—146
xvi., 9, 10—332
xvi., 12—332
xvi., 15—39
Marriage, 157–197
Christ on, 50, 167, 182
Attitude toward, 167–169, 180–182, 189
Definition of, 168, 169
Polyandry, 169
Polygamy, 169
Contract of, 160–163
Blackstone, W. H., 161
Story, Judge, 162
Definition of, 160–163
Divorce, *see* Divorce
Duty of, 169–171
Exception, 170, 171
Lamb, C., 171
Evans *vs.* Evans, 192, 193
Gibbons on, 192
Gibbons, J. C., on, 189
in Greece, 187
Greeley, H., 188, 189
Health, 175
Mental, 175
Physical, 175
Am. Society of Sanitary and Moral Prophylaxis on, 177
Great Black Plague, 177
Indiana law, 180
Morrow, Dr. P. A., 178
Reeve, C. H., 176, 177
Social diseases, 177
Tuberculosis, 177
Washington law, 180
Hume on, 191, 192
Importance of, 160
Gladstone, W. E., on, 160
Krauskopf, Rabbi, on, 194, 195
License to, 173–175
Brown, H. B., 174
Roman Catholic Church, 174, 175
Object of, 164–167, 182–189
Adler, F., 165, 166
Bolce, H., 185, 186
Christ, 165
Colleges, 184–186
Giddings, F. H., 185
Happiness, 184–188
Hegel, 165
Howard, G. E., 184
Savage, Rev. M. J., 182, 183
Shakespeare, 165
Ward, Mrs. H., 186
Wright, C. D., 182
Zueblin, C., 184, 185
Origin of, 163–167
Physical health, *see* Health *Id.*
in Rome, 187
Sacredness of, 171, 172
Safeguarding, 171
Marriage license, *see* License *Id.*
Physical health, *see* Health *Id.*
Savage, Rev. M. J., 182, 183
Separation, *see* Separation
Socialism on, *see* Socialism
Status of, 160, 163
Fulton, J., 162, 163
Milton, 188
Story, Judge, 162
Martineau, J., on Christ, 11

Marx, K.,
God, belief in, 72
Materialism, 43, 44
Pathfinder, the, 34
Property, private, 47, 48
Religion, permanency of, 89
Society, uplifting, 67
Violence, use of, 98, 99
Masten, V. M., on Criminals, treatment of, 210, 211
Matthew iv., 18–20—41, 85
iv., 19—79
iv., 23—118
v., 13—66
v., 16—82
v., 16, 45—82
v., 17, 18—49
v., 32—50
v., 39–41—140
v., 42—46
vi., 1, 9—82
vi., 4—71
vi., 9, 10—79
vi., 10—82
vi., 19, 20, 42—252
vi., 24—253
vi., 33, 41, 63—68
vii., 7—63
vii., 11, 21—82
vii., 24, 25—65
viii., 5, 13—251
viii., 14—247
ix., 35—133
x., 7—118
x., 16—152
x., 23—142
x., 32, 33—82
xi., 28—39
xi., 29—79
xii., 1–6—334
xii., 8—335
xii., 10–13—334
xii., 34, 35—64
xii., 50—82
xiii., 2—118
xiii., 13—134
xiii., 31, 32—134
xvi., 16, 17—69
xvi., 17—82
xvi., 24, 25—266
xvi., 26—42
xvii., 24–27—26, 95
xviii., 3—64
xviii., 10, 14, 19—82
xviii., 15–17—150, 155, 325, 350
xix., 4—165
xix., 3–6—50, 165
xix., 26, 27—86
xix., 29—83
xxi., 12, 13—375
xxii., 9—39
xxii., 17–21—26
xxii., 21—94
xxiii., 23—27
xxiv., 14—118
xxv., 14–30—257, 304
xxv., 16, 21—259
xxv., 32–46—131, 132
xxv., 34—84
xxv., 46—82, 253
xxvi., 7–10, 13—43
xxvi., 19—82
xxvi., 39, 42—79
xxvi., 45–50—146
xxvi., 51–53—154
xxvi., 52—376
xxvi., 52, 53, 57—98
xxvi., 67—146
xxvii., 30—146
xxviii., 8–10—332
xxviii., 57—251
Mediation, duty of, 155, 156
International, *see* International controversies
Labour, *see* Labour
Mill, J. S.,
Individual influence, 9, 10
Political economy, 301
Milton,
Marriage, 188
Overcoming by force, 152
Minimum wage, *see* Wage

Mohammed,
Effect of, on Arabia, 10
on Turkey, 10
Monopoly, *see* Wealth, accumulation of
Moody on Trusts, 320, 321
Moody's convert, 141
Moran, T. F., on Luxuries, 272
Morris, W., on Marriage, 55, 56
Morrow, Dr. P. A., on Social diseases, 178
Münzer on Anarchy, 19
Murillo's picture on Work, 310

N

Nation, definition of, 345, 346
Cooley on, 345, 346
National Socialist party, 35
Neckar on Effect of individual opinion, 7
Negotiation, duty of, 155, 156
Nelson, Lord, on Trusting, 242
New York Parole Board, *see* Parole Board
New York *Volkszeitung*,
God, belief in, 69
Property, private, 46
Nitti, F. S., on Christ a Socialist, 31
Non-resistance, 136–156
Christ on, 139, 141, 151–156
Courts, abolition,
Christ on, 149, 150
Exception, 153–155
Government, abolition of,
Christ on, 149, 150
Oppression of, 150, 151
Reformation of, 150, 151
Legal injustice, 148–150
Christ on, 149, 150
Tolstoi on, 148, 149
Literal interpretation, 149
Method of acting, 155, 156
Milton on, 152
Physical violence, 140–145
Christ on, 141, 142, 149
Crosby, E., 142–145
Moody's convert, 141
Tolstoi, L., 142–145
Wright, R., 145
Reputation, injury to, 146–148
Christ on, 146–148
Defence of, 148
Emerson, 148
Lincoln, A., 146, 147
Salvation Army leader, 147, 148
Ribot on, 151
Schiller on, 152
Tolstoi, L., on, 152, 153

O

Opinion, individual,
Effect of, on public opinion, 7–10
Gladden, Rev. W., 8, 9
Illustration, 7, 8
Jenks, Prof. J., 8
Mill, J. S., 9, 10
Neckar, 7
Formation of, 4–7
Hadley, Dr. A. T., 6, 7
Vincent, G. E., 5, 6
Responsibility for, 10
Opinion, public, *see* Public opinion
Ostracism, social, 156, 294–296
Christ on, 295, 296
Owen R., on Socialism, 34

P

Page, E. de, on Honesty, 263, 264
Parker, J., on Church attendance, 337, 338

Parole Board, 233–235
Constitution of, 233
New York, 234, 235
Power of, 233, 234
Peace congress, *see* International bodies
Perkins, G. W., on Sanitary conditions, 293
Pernerstofer Resolution, 76
Phillips, Chaplain, Education of criminals, 226
Philosophers, effect of, 11
Picture on Wealth, 255, 256
Platforms,
Chicago, 41
Erfurt, 41, 110, 111
Gotha, 41
Vienna, 41
Political economy, 301–304
School of,
New, 302–304
Wright, C. D., 302, 303
Old, 301–302
Carlyle, T., 302
Mill, J. S., 301
Polyandry, Christ on, 169
Polygamy, Christ on, 169
Potter, Bishop H. C., on Ex-convict, 237
Poverty, causes of, 392–396
Prices, *see* Wealth, accumulation of
Prisoner, *see* Criminal
Prisons, 201, 215, 218–230
Building, 218–220
Collins, C. V., 219
in New York, 218–220
Christ on, 201
Classification in, 221
in New York, 221
Confinement, solitary, 221
Penn. system, 221
Essential, 218
Examination in, 220, 221
Christ on, 220
Lalone, M., on, 215
Meals in, 222, 223
Mingling in, 221–223
School in, 223–230
Industrial instruction, 222, 224–226
Brinkerhoff, Gen. R., on, 226, 227
Importance of, 224, 225
Phillips, Chaplain, 226
State use, 226, 227
Mental instruction, 223, 224
Carlyle, T., on, 224
Clement XI., 223
Hirsch, Dr., 224
Roosevelt, T., 223, 224
Wey, Dr., 223
Religious instruction, 227–230
Asarias, Brother, on, 230
Bois, H. M., 229, 230
Eliot, C. H., 228, 229
Gates, Prof., 227, 228
Morality and, 228, 229
Spencer, H., 229
Solitary confinement, *see* Confinement above
State use system, *see* School, industrial
Workshop in, 222
Probation, adult, 214–217
Lalone, M., on, 215
Report on, 216, 217
States having, 215, 216
Property, private, *see* Wealth
Christ on, 46, 47; *see* Wealth
Socialists on, 46–48
Proudhon, P. J., on Anarchy, 21

Public opinion,
American, sovereign, 3
Bryce, James, on, 2
Corporate reform, 294
Definition, 3
Giddings, Prof., 3
Small & Vincent, 3
Duty to form, 150, 151
Effect of individual opinion on, 7–10
Gladden, Rev. W., 8, 9
Illustration, 7, 8
Jenks, Prof. J., 8
Mill, J. S., 9, 10
Neckar, 7
Effect of, on individual opinion, 4
Baldwin, Prof., 4

R

Rabelais on Anarchy, 19
Rauschenbusch, W., on effect of low wages, 284, 285
Reave, C. H., on Bill of health, 176, 177
Religion, permanency of,
Christ on, 87
Socialism on, 87–93
Religious schools abolished, 110, 111
Renan, E., Christ an Anarchist, 24, 25
Reputation, injury to, *see* Nonresistance
Rhodes, C., on Scholarship, 367, 368
Ribot, service, effect of, 151
Rodbertus, K., on Socialism, 34
Roman Catholic Church on Marriage, 174, 175
Roosevelt, T.,
Education of criminals, 223, 224
Tenements, 394
Root, E., on Arbitration, 381
Ross, E. A., on Criminaloid, 291, 292
Ross, J., on Labour and capital, 325, 326
Russell, Lord, on Duty of men, 348

S

Sabbath, *see* Sunday
Saint-Simon, H., on Socialism, 34
Salter, W. H.,
Anarchy, 23
Government, 24
Salvation Army leader, 147, 148
Sanitary conditions, 293
Perkins, G. W., on, 293
Savage, Rev. M. J., on Marriage and divorce, 182, 183
Say, J. N., on Luxuries, 272
Schiller on Reconciliation, 152
Schools,
Prison, *see* Criminal
Religious, *see* Religious schools
Remedy for Divorce, *see* Divorce
Sunday, *see* Divorce
Schouler on Marriage, 160
Schurman, J. G., war, preparation for, 352, 353
Schurz, C., on War and peace, 380
Seminaries, *see* Theological seminaries
Senior, Prof., on Luxuries, 271
Separation, 193
Christ on, 193
Grounds for, 193
Service, *see* Christ
Sherman, W. T., on War, 359
Simple life, 265
Small & Vincent on Public opinion, 3
Smith, A., on Luxuries, 271, 272

Social ostracism, *see* Ostracism
Social vice, 268–270
Socialism, 31–112
  Christ a Socialist,
    Campbell, R. J., 31
    Holzmann, O., 31
    Nitti, F. S., 31
    Spargo, J., 38
    White, Rev. E., 31
    Willard, F. E., 31
  Christianity *vs.*,
    Aveling, E., 107, 108
    Bax, B., 108, 109
    Bebel, A., 112
    Dietzgen, J., 110
    Ferri, E., 109
    Herron, G. D., 108
    Ladoff, I., 107
    Leathan, J., 109, 110
    Sozial Demokrat, 109
  Church *vs.*,
    Bebel, A., 111
    Untermann, E., 112
    Vandervelde, E., 111, 112
  Churches abolished, 108, 111
  Classes of mankind,
    Christ, 39
    Engels, F., 39
    Spargo, J. S., 39, 40
  Communist manifesto, 61
    Lafargue, P., 62
  Definition, 32, 33
    Hillquit, M., 36, 37
    Liebknecht, W., 38
    Spargo, J., 37
    Worker, 37
  God, belief in,
    Bax, B., 71
    Bebel, A., 76, 77
    Der Volkstaat, 69
    Dietzgen, J., 78
    Engels, F., 77, 78
    Labriola, A., 71, 72
    Lafargue, P., 75, 76
    La Monte, R. R., 73–75
    Marx, K., 72
    New York Volkszeitung, 69
    Pernerstofer Resolution, 76
    Sozial Demokrat, 72, 73
    Untermann, E., 69, 70
  Government, *see* State
  Immortality,
    Bax, B., 83
    Lafargue, P., 83
  International party, 35
    Chicago platform, 35
  Leaders,
    Aveling, E., 35
    Babeuf, 34
    Bax, B., 35
    Bebel, A., 35
    Blanc, L., 34
    Blatchford, R., 35
    Buonarotti, 33, 34
    Debs, E. V., 35
    Deville, G., 35
    Dietzgen, J., 35
    Engels, F., 35, 36
    Ferri, E., 35
    Fourier, 33, 34
    Herron, G. D., 35
    Hillquit, M., 35
    Jaures, J., 35
    Kautsky, K., 35
    Kerr, C. H., 35
    Labriola, A., 35
    Ladoff, I., 35
    Lafargue, P., 35
    La Monte, R. R., 35
    L'Ange, 33, 34
    Lasalle, F., 35
    Liebknecht, W., 35
    Loria, A., 35
    Marx, K., 34, 36
    Owen, R., 34
    Rodbertus, K., 34
    Simons, A. M., 35
    Spargo, J. S., 35
    Stein, L., 34
    Untermann, E., 35
    Vail, C. H., 35

Socialism (*Continued*)
Vandervelde, E., 35
Videl, 34
Man,
Development of, 65
Jaures, J., 65
Lafargue, P., 65
Redemption of, 86
Bebel, A., 86
Dietzgen, J., 85
Marriage,
Bax, B., 55, 56
Bebel, A., 52, 53
Carpenter, C., 56, 57
Debs, E. V., 59–61
Engels, F., 53, 54
Herron, G. D., 58, 59
Hyndman, H. M., 61, 62
Jaures, J., 50
Kautsky, K., 54
Kerr, C. H., 57, 58
La Monte, R. R. ,51, 52
Morris, W., 55, 56
Materialism of, 41–45
Bax, B., 41
Engels, F., 42, 43
Herron, G. D., 45
Hillquit, M., 45
La Monte, R. R., 42
Marx, K., 43, 44
Nature, human, change of, 64
Kautsky, K., 64
Untermann, E., 64
Origin of, 33–35
Property, private,
Communist manifesto, 47
Jaures, J., 46
Marx, K., 47, 48
New York *Volkszeitung*, 46
Religion, permanency of,
Bax, B., 88
Bebel, A., 91
Dietzgen, J., 87, 88
Engels, F., 89–91
Ferri, E., 87
Lafargue, P., 90, 91, 92
La Monte, R. R., 92, 93
Loria, A., 89
Marx, K., 89
Religious schools abolished, 110, 111
Schools, religious, *see* Religious schools
Seminaries, *see* Theological seminaries
Society,
Changing, 68
Engels, F., 68
Hillquit, M., 68
Uplifting, 66, 67
Bax, B., 66
Marx, K., 67
Spargo, J. S., 66, 67
Soul, *see* Immortality
State to be abolished
Bebel, A., 96
Communist manifesto, 94, 95
Engels, F., 94
La Monte, R. R., 96, 97
Theological seminaries abolished, 110, 111
Violence,
Bax, B., 103, 104
Bebel, A., 99, 100
Dietzgen, J., 102, 103
Ferri, E., 101
Hillquit, M., 104–106
Kerr, C. H., 101, 102
Liebknecht, W., 101
Marx, K., 98, 99
Will, freedom of, 63
Labriola, A., 63
La Monte, R. R., 63
World, other,
Despises,
Bax, B., 85
Sozial Demokrat, 85

Socialism (*Continued*)
Existence of,
Engels, F., 82
Liebknecht, W., 82
Society,
Changing, 68
Christianising of, 131–134
Gladden, W., 133, 134
Crime and, 207
Reconstruction of,
Attempts at, 389
Devine, E. T., 391
Knowledge, 390, 391
Investigation, 392–396
Liebig, J. V., 393
Roosevelt, T., 394
Wise, S. S., 392
Wright, C. D., 395
Need of, 389
Remedies,
Christ's, 401–406
Legal, 397, 398
Love, 399–401
Man, valuing, 401–409
Christ on, 401
Stöcker on, 401, 402
Socialism, 404
Removal of evils, 396–409
Christ on, 399, 400
Unit of, 159
Uplifting of, 66, 67, 159, 160
Christian duty, on, 409
City, 406–409
Chesterton, G. K., 407, 408
Comte, 406
Welfare of, 159, 160
Gladstone, W. E., 160
Spencer, H., 160
Soul, immortality, *see* Immortality
Sozial Demokrat,
God, belief in, 72, 73
Socialism *vs.* Christianity, 109
World, despises other, 85
Spargo, J. S.,
Christ a Socialist, 38
Classes of mankind, 39, 40
Leader of Socialism, 35
Socialist platform, 37
Society, uplifting, 66, 67
Spencer, H.,
Religious education, 229
Social welfare, 160
Stanton, E. M., Lincoln's treatment of, 147
State, *see* Government
Stead, W. T., Russian revolution, 357, 358
Stein, L., on Socialism, 34
Stephen, Sir J., on Crime, 209
Stirner, M., on Anarchy, 19, 20
Stöcker, Pastor, on Child labour, 401, 402
Story, Judge, on Marriage, 162
Strikes, *see* Labour
Sunday, 329–342
Art galleries, opening of, 338, 339
Base-ball on, 340
Card-playing on, 339
Christ on, 333–336
Church attendance, 337, 338
Parker, J., on, 337, 338
Dancing on, 340
Dedication of, 332–335
Golf on, 340
Library opening on, 338, 339
Lord's Day, 332–335

Sunday (*Continued*)
Novel-reading on, 338
Rest day, a, 335–342
Farre, J. R., on, 335, 336
Riding on, 340
Sabbath, 329–333
Abrogation of, 332–335
Observance of, 329–330
Tennis on, 340
Theatre opening on, 339, 340
Work on, 333–337
For others, 334, 335
For self, 333, 334

T

Taft, Pres.,
National honour, 374
War and peace, 363, 364
Tainted money, 277–280
Tawney, J. A., on Unity of nations, 355
Temperance,
Divorce and, 197
History of, 7, 8
Liebig, J. V., on, 393
Work and, 393–396
Wright, C. D., on, 395
Tertullian on War, 376
Theological seminaries abolished, 110, 111
2 Thess. iii., 6–15—249
Thompson, C. B., Christ on wealth, 267
Thompson, F., on Divorce, 188
Tolstoi, L.,
Christ an Anarchist, 25
Judging, 207, 208
Non-resistance, 142–145, 152, 153
Treaties,
Anglo-Japanese, 362
Argentine and Chile, 372, 383–385
Baltic Sea neutral, 371
Canada and U. S., 383
Chile and Argentine, 372, 383–385
Denmark and Italy, 372
Denmark and Netherlands, 372
England and France, 371
England, Russia, and Norway, 371
France and England, 371
Italy and Denmark, 372
Japan and U. S., 371
Jay, 365
Netherlands and Denmark, 372
North Sea neutral, 371
Norway neutral ground, 371
Norway, Russia, and England, 371
Number of, 365, 366
Pacific neutral, 371
Russia, England, and Norway, 371
U. S. and Canada, 383
U. S. and Japan, 371
Trusts, *see* Corporations
Tuberculosis, 177
Tucker, B. R., on Government, 23
Turkey, Mohammedanism in, 10

U

Unit,
Christ on, 159
Family, 159
Individual, 159
Social, 159
U. S. citizens, *see* Citizen
U. S. Constitution, *see* Constitution
U. S., divorce in, 189–191
Untermann, E.,
Churches, war on, 112

Untermann, E. (*Continued*)
God,
Belief in, 69, 70
Obedience to, 80
Nature, human, change of, 64
Socialist leader, 35

V

Vandervelde, E.,
Churches, war on, 111, 112
Socialist leader, 35
Van Dyke, J. C., on Use of wealth, 267, 268
Videl on Socialism, 34
Vincent, G. E., on Individual opinion, 5, 6
Violence, use of,
Christ on, 97
Physical, *see* Non-resistance
Socialism, 98–106
Vocational training, 318, 319

W

Wage, *see* Labour
Minimum, 283–287
Christ on, 283, 286, 287
Definition, 284
Henderson, C.R., 284
Effect of, 284–287
Rauschenbusch, W., 284, 285
in U. S., 285
Waldron on, 285
Waldron on Wages in U. S., 285
War, *see* International controversies
Ward, Mrs. H., on Marriage and divorce, 186
Washington, Physical health law, 180
Watts on Use of wealth, 287
Webster, D., on Christianity, 13, 14
Wealth, 245
Accumulation of, 254–266
Christ on, 254–259, 264
Credit, 258, 259
Danger in, 292, 293
Honesty, 263, 264
Lincoln, A., 264
Page, E. de, 263, 264
Misrepresentation, 262, 263
Monopoly, 260–263
Giddings, Prof., 261, 262
Morality of, 292, 293
Picture on, 255, 256
Prices, 259–263
Sanitary conditions, *see* Sanitary
Administration of, 266–276
Anderson, W. B., 266, 267
Clement, 266
Cooley, C. H., 267
Gambling, 268–270
Harnack, A., 266
Horse-racing, 268–270
Liquor, 268–270
Luxuries, 271–273
Baudrillat, M., 272
Ely, R. T., 272, 273
Laveleye, M. de., 272
Moran, T. F., 272
Say, J. N., 272
Senior, Prof., 271
Smith, A., 271, 272
Social vice, 268–270
Thompson, C. B., 267
Van Dyke, J. C., 267, 268

Wealth (*Continued*)
Watts, 287
Extravagances, 270, 271
Louis XIV., 270
Attitude toward, 251–254
Christ's, 251–254
Blessings of, 280–287
Carnegie, A., 280–282
Christian, 280
Club rooms, 281–283
Emil, 282
Gymnasia, 282, 283
Libraries, 281–283
Minimum wage, *see* Wage
Corporations, *see* Corporations
Credit, *see* Accumulation, *id.*
Curses of, 276–280
Hoarding of, 276, 277
Inheritance of, 277
Tainted, 277–280
Worship of, 276
Definition of, 247
Century Dictionary, 247
Gunton, G., 247
Jevons, 247
Display of, 273–276
in Babylon, 274–276
in Greece, 274–276
in Rome, 274–276
in U. S. 273, 274
Honesty, *see* Accumulation, *id.*
Men of, 250, 251
Christ on, 250, 251
Misrepresentation, *see* Accumulation, *id.*
Monopoly, *see* Accumulation, *id.*
Prices, *see* Accumulation, *id.*
Private ownership, 247–250
Christ on, 247–250
Community of goods, 248, 249
Wey, Dr., on Criminals, 223
White, Rev. E., Christ a Socialist, 31
Whitney, Maj., on Lincoln, 147
Will, freedom of,
Christ on, 63
Socialism on, 63
Labriola, A., 63
La Monte, R. R., 63
Willard, F. E., Christ a Socialist, 31
Wilson, W., on Work, 313
Wise, S. S., on Poverty, 392
Wishart, A. W., on Work, 311
Work, *see* Labour
World, other,
Christ, 82, 85
Socialism, 82, 85
Wright, Dr. C. D., on Marriage and divorce, 182
Arbitration, 327, 328
Drinking, 395
Marriage and divorce, 182
Political economy, 302, 303
Wright, Gov. R., on Courage, 145

Z

Zueblin, C., on Marriage and divorce, 184, 185

A Selection from the Catalogue of

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

Complete Catalogue sent
on application

Vital American Problems

An Attempt to Solve the "Trust," "Labor," and "Negro" Problems

By Harry Earl Montgomery

Crown 8vo. $1.50 net. By mail, $1.65

Contents

TRUST PROBLEM

I. The Problem.—II. State or Federal Control.—III. The Solution: Bureau of Corporations—Incorporation Tax—Liability of Stockholders and Directors—Prospectus or Advertisement — Annual Report — Annual Examination — Property Taxed Locally—Tax on Profits—Valuation of Assets —Actions—Departmental Expenses.—IV. Feasibility of Plan.

FREIGHT-RATE PROBLEM

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

I. The Problem.—II. The Solution: State Corporation Department—Tax on Charters—Property Tax—Duties and Powers of Superintendent—Graduated Profit Tax—Ten-Year Averaging.

LABOR PROBLEM

I. The Problem.—II. The Solution: (Plan I)—(Plan II).

NEGRO PROBLEM

I. The Problem.—II. The Solution: Education: *a.* Universal Education—*b.* Elementary Schools—*c.* Colleges—*d.* Manual Training—*e.* Manual Training for Girls—*f.* Religion (Religious Influence) — (Religious Education) — (Churches). Ideals—Politics—Social Equality—Federal Aid—Conclusion.

"It is not often that the troubling economic and social questions of our time and country are handled, in an extended discussion of them, with as much fairness of mind, carefulness of study, clearness of thought, and felicity of expression as we find in this volume by Mr. Harry Earl Montgomery."—J. N. Larned in *Buffalo Express.*

"A sane and thoughtful contribution to the great questions which the American people are facing."—*New York Times.*

"A useful book, both because of its clarity of statement and its suggestiveness."—*The Outlook.*

"Serious study and sound reasoning mark the work and make it one for the thoughtful."—*Denver Republican.*

"A book to arouse thought and to educate the public mind along needed lines."—*Chicago Interior.*

"A notable contribution to the economic and social literature of the period."—*St. Louis Post-Despatch.*

Date Due

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

HN
31
M787 34382
AUTHOR
Montgomery, H.E.
TITLE
Christ's social remedi
DATE | BORROWER'S NAME

...at. No. 1155-A